

PROTECTION OF CULTURAL PROPERTY
IN THE EVENT OF ARMED CONFLICT

INFORMATION
ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF
THE CONVENTION FOR THE PROTECTION
OF CULTURAL PROPERTY
IN THE EVENT OF ARMED CONFLICT,

THE HAGUE 1954 ;

20 JAN. 1985

1984 REPORTS /

CLT/MD/3
Paris, December 1984

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
INTRODUCTION	5
CONVENTION AND PROTOCOL FOR THE PROTECTION OF CULTURAL PROPERTY IN THE EVENT OF ARMED CONFLICT	19
REPORTS FROM HIGH CONTRACTING PARTIES TO THE CONVENTION	
Austria	21
Bulgaria	22
Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic	24
Cyprus	25
France	25
German Democratic Republic	28
Germany, Federal Republic of	29
Holy See	30
Islamic Republic of Iran	30
Jordan	33
Kuwait.	33
Liechtenstein	33
Luxembourg	34
Mexico	34
Netherlands	34
Nigeria	37
Norway	37
Poland.	38
Saudi Arabia	39
Spain	39
Switzerland	39
Syrian Arab Republic	40
Thailand	40
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	41

INTRODUCTION

Article 26, paragraph 2, of the Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict, adopted at The Hague in 1954, stipulates that, at least every four years, the High Contracting Parties 'shall forward to the Director-General a report giving whatever information they think suitable concerning any measures being taken, prepared or contemplated by their respective administrations in fulfilment of the ... Convention and of the Regulations for its execution'.

Reports were received by the Director-General in 1962, 1965-1966, 1969-1970 and 1977-1978, and published in documents Unesco/CA/RBC/1/3 and Add. 1-6, SHC/MD/1 dated 19 May 1967, SHC/MD/6 dated 30 April 1970 and CC/MD/41 of July 1979 respectively.

In November 1982 the Director-General again invited the High Contracting Parties to forward to him the reports referred to in Article 26 of the Convention. The Director-General received reports from twenty-four High Contracting Parties.

These latest reports of High Contracting Parties are published in the present document, which also broadly recalls the historical background of the Convention and describes the measures taken in connection with its implementation.

I. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Adoption of the Convention

1. The Convention and Protocol for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict were adopted by an intergovernmental conference, convened by the Executive Board of Unesco in pursuance of a resolution of the General Conference. At the invitation of the Netherlands Government, this Conference met at The Hague from 21 April to 14 May 1954.

2. All the Member States of Unesco, together with a number of non-Member States, as decided by the Executive Board (33 EX/Decisions 8.3.1), were invited to send delegations furnished with the necessary powers to enable them, if required, to sign international agreements. Of the eighty-six States thus invited, fifty-six were represented at the conference.

Signature

3. The Convention and Protocol remained open for signature by all States invited to the conference, from 14 May to 31 December 1954. By this latter date, the Convention had been signed by fifty States and the Protocol by forty States.

Entry into force

4. In accordance with the provisions of Article 33, the Convention entered into force on 7 August 1956, that is, three months after five instruments of ratification had been deposited. It enters into force, for each State which has ratified or acceded to it, three months after the deposit of its instrument of ratification or accession. This is subject, however, to the provisions of Article 33, paragraph 3, which stipulates that ratifications and accessions shall take effect immediately when the States ratifying or acceding are Parties to a conflict as defined in the Convention.

States invited to accede

5. The Convention contains a clause stipulating that from the date of its entry into force it shall be open for accession by all States invited to the Hague Conference which have not signed it, as well as by any other State invited to accede by the Executive Board. Availing itself of this clause, the Board adopted at its 53rd session a resolution inviting all States becoming members of Unesco which had not been invited to the Hague Conference in 1954 to accede to the Convention.

Ratification and accessions

6. As at 31 March 1984, seventy-one instruments of ratification or accession to the Convention and sixty to the Protocol had been deposited with the Director-General. A list of those States, together with the dates of deposit of the instruments, is annexed to this introduction.

II. MEASURES TAKEN IN CONNECTION WITH THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CONVENTION (1979-1983)

International list of persons

7. Article 1 of the Regulations for the execution of the Convention stipulates that on the entry into force of the Convention, the Director-General 'shall compile an international list consisting of all persons nominated by the High Contracting Parties as qualified to carry out the functions of Commissioner-General for Cultural Property'. In accordance with the terms of the same Article which provides for the periodic revision of this list, a revised list compiled as at 31 March 1983 was transmitted to the High Contracting Parties on 5 November 1983.

International Register of Cultural Property under Special Protection

8. Article 8 of the Convention provides that, subject to certain conditions 'There may be placed under special protection a limited number of refuges intended to shelter movable cultural property in the event of armed conflict, of centres containing monuments and other immovable cultural property of very great importance' and that such special protection is granted by their entry in the 'International Register of Cultural Property under Special Protection'. Article 12 of the Regulations for the execution of the Convention further stipulates that the Director-General shall maintain this Register and that he shall furnish copies to the Secretary-General of the United Nations and to the High Contracting Parties. Under Article 9 of the Convention, the High Contracting Parties undertake to ensure the immunity of cultural property entered in the Register by refraining 'from any act of hostility directed against such property and, except for the cases provided for in paragraph 5 of Article 8, from any use of such property or its surroundings for military purposes'. Article 13 of the above-mentioned Regulations provides that any High Contracting Party may submit an application for entry in the Register.

9. The following entries have been made in the above-mentioned Register, in accordance with the provisions of the Convention:
the whole of the Vatican City State, the registration of which came into effect on 11 March 1960;
the Alt-Aussee Refuge in Upper Austria, the registration of which came into effect on 7 January 1968;
six refuges for cultural property in the Netherlands, the registration of which came into effect on 2 July 1969;
the Central Refuge Oberrieder Stollen in the Federal Republic of Germany.
Since this last registration, in 1978, no further request for registration has been received.

Middle East

10. The mandates of the two Commissioners-General for Cultural Property accredited in 1967,

one to Israel and the other to the Arab Governments concerned (Egypt, the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, Lebanon, the Syrian Arab Republic), were terminated, at the Commissioners'-General request, on 1 February 1977 and on 30 June 1977 respectively. For the appointment of their successors, Switzerland was chosen in January 1977 by all the Parties to the conflict as a neutral State to discharge the functions of a Protecting Power as provided for in Article 9 of the Regulations. Since that date, the Permanent Delegate of Switzerland to Unesco has been conducting negotiations for the appointment of new Commissioners-General. During these negotiations, all the Parties to the conflict have by joint agreement chosen Professor H. R. Sennhauser (of Swiss nationality) as the future Commissioner-General for Cultural Property who will be accredited to the Government of Israel. However, it has not been possible to obtain the final agreement of all the Parties to the conflict on the choice of the future Commissioner-General for Cultural Property to be accredited to the Arab Governments concerned. The negotiations are therefore continuing.

Tyre

11. The General Conference, at its twenty-first session held in Belgrade from 23 September to 28 October 1981, considered in resolution 4/13 that 'the archaeological site of Tyre should . . . be placed under the protection of Unesco (Article 8 of the Hague Convention and Article 13 of the Regulations for the Execution of that Convention)'. By the terms of the same resolution, the General Conference congratulated the Director-General 'on the efforts he is making to promote the preservation of this site', requested him 'to continue his action for this purpose by all the means available to him' and authorized him 'within the limits of the budgetary estimates, to appoint an adviser for the cultural heritage of the archaeological site of Tyre and its surrounding area, whose duty it will be to report to him on the situation and to assist all concerned to determine the emergency measures to be taken to protect and preserve the cultural heritage . . . '.

12. On 7 June 1982, the Permanent Delegate of Lebanon to Unesco informed the Director-General that 'the aggression of the Israeli army, which for some hours has been attacking and invading Lebanon, has reached the archaeological site of the town of Tyre and its surrounding area', and requested him to call for a halt to all military operations on the historical site.

13. On 10 June 1982, by virtue of the role that the Hague Convention specifically assigns to Unesco and of the mandate assigned to him by the twenty-first session of the General Conference to continue his efforts to promote the preservation of the archaeological site of Tyre, the Director-General launched an urgent appeal for military operations to cease immediately in the region of Tyre and for the necessary measures to be taken as a matter of urgency to safeguard and protect this unique and priceless cultural property, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the 1954

Hague Convention. In the same appeal, the Director-General also urgently requested Member States and all national and international organizations to use their influence to put an end to all hostilities, a necessary condition for organizing the effective protection of the cultural property situated on the territory of the Republic of Lebanon.

14. Referring still to resolution 4/13 adopted by the General Conference at its twenty-first session, and to the Hague Convention which deals in Article 23 with Unesco assistance in the event of armed conflict, the Director-General, also on 10 June 1982, made the proposal to the Lebanese Government that, within the limits of the Organization's programme and of the resources available, Unesco would provide it with such technical assistance as it might wish in order to organize the protection of its cultural property affected by the conflict.

15. By letters dated 11, 14, 17 and 23 June 1982, the Permanent Delegate of Lebanon to Unesco expressed his country's great appreciation of the measures taken by the Director-General, asked him to send a personal representative who could make an on-the-spot report to him and further requested him to use his powers to remind the occupying authorities that 'they were forbidden by international law to do any damage or carry out any archaeological excavation whatsoever'.

16. In response to his appeal, the Director-General received communications from two other Member States, Austria and Israel, from two intergovernmental organizations, from three international non-governmental organizations, and from the Palestine Liberation Organization. In his letter of 24 June 1982, the Head of the Political Department of the Palestine Liberation Organization assured the Director-General that it would do its utmost to safeguard Tyre and all the cultural property situated in Lebanon and to preserve them from the current hostilities'.

17. On 5 July 1982, the Director-General sent a cable to the Israeli Minister of Foreign Affairs, informing him of his decision to dispatch to Tyre a team of four experts who would report to him on the state of preservation of the archaeological site and its surrounding area and propose to him any emergency measures needed to protect them.

18. The Deputy Director-General of the Israeli Ministry of Foreign Affairs, in his reply, received on 7 July 1982, expressed the readiness of his government to receive this team. He further recalled his government's position, which had already been expressed in his reply of 14 June 1982 to the Director-General's appeal, namely, that as far as the Israeli authorities were concerned, the presence of 'terrorist groups' of the Palestine Liberation Organization using the archaeological site as an ammunition depot and as an artillery emplacement was what, until then, had prevented the site from being adequately protected.

19. The team sent by the Director-General carried out its mission from 11 to 15 July 1982 and submitted to the Director-General a report

containing its findings and recommendations, which was transmitted to the Lebanese authorities. In pursuance of one of these recommendations, 150 signs bearing the distinctive emblem provided for in Articles 16 and 17 of the Convention were prepared at the Organization's expense and given to the Lebanese authorities so that they could mark Tyre's archaeological areas and areas containing monuments. Subsequently, at the request of the Lebanese Government, a team of two archaeologists visited Tyre in February 1983. By a letter dated 24 March 1983 to the Ambassador and Permanent Delegate of Israel to Unesco, the Director-General drew the attention of the Israeli authorities to one of the observations made by the team, namely, that the Israeli army was carrying out earth-works alongside the archaeological area and that in one place it had encroached on that area. He also took the opportunity to remind Israel that, by its ratification of the Hague Convention, it was committed to showing respect for cultural property situated on the territory of the High Contracting Parties. In her reply dated 9 May 1983, the Ambassador of Israel asserted that the instructions given to the Israeli army concerning the protection of cultural property were being fully complied with and applied, but she made no observations regarding the earth-works. Accordingly, the Director-General wrote once again on 1 July 1983 to the Ambassador of Israel to draw her attention to these works.

20. To give effect to resolution 4/13 adopted by the General Conference at its twenty-first session, the Director-General further appointed Professor Ernest Will (France), in agreement with the Lebanese authorities, as adviser for the cultural heritage of the archaeological site of Tyre and its surrounding area.

21. In addition, it should be noted that at its twenty-second session, the General Conference adopted resolution 11/7 by which it authorized the Director-General 'to undertake, within the limits of available funds, the technical studies needed in order to draw up a detailed plan of action for [the safeguarding of Tyre and its surrounding area] and to define procedures for its promotion in the form of an international campaign'. In pursuance of this resolution, the Director-General submitted to the Lebanese authorities, on 6 February 1984, a preliminary draft of the detailed plan of action concerning the safeguarding of Tyre. At the date of drawing up this report (17 September 1984), the Lebanese Government had not yet come to a decision regarding that plan.

Iran-Iraq

22. After the opening of hostilities, the Director-General sent telegrams on 29 October 1980 to the Governments of Iraq and Iran, both High Contracting Parties to the Convention, in which he drew their attention to the obligation to apply the Convention which they had contracted. In particular, he drew their attention to the terms of Article 4, paragraph 1, of the Convention. In a reply dated 27 November 1980, the Government of Iraq made it known that it was meeting its

obligations under the Convention. For his part, on 13 May 1982, the Permanent Delegate of Iran to Unesco sent a letter to the Director-General in which he stated: 'It goes without saying that, having subscribed to the Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict, Iran remains faithful to it and will continue to comply with it as it has done to date'.

Meeting of legal experts

23. In 1983 the Director-General called a high-level meeting of legal experts to discuss the provisions of the Hague Convention of 1954, and especially the provisions concerning Unesco's role in its implementation. This meeting was held in Vienna on 17, 18 and 19 October 1983. Twelve of the experts invited took part. To assist them, they had a report by Mr Jiri Toman on 'Unesco's mandate for implementation of the Hague Convention on the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict', written at the request of Unesco. As provided for in the agenda, the discussion bore on the record of thirty years' application of the Hague Convention, and on the role assigned to Unesco in implementing it.

24. While noting that the Convention was an essential ingredient of international humanitarian law and ought to constitute a very useful instrument for the protection of mankind's cultural heritage, the experts observed that it had not been effective enough, owing, particularly, to States having lost interest in it. They felt that Unesco should make every effort to restore a desirable level of effectiveness to the Convention by organizing a conference on the protection of the heritage of mankind, particularly in the event of armed conflict. The conference would be attended by all Member States of the Organization

and would be preceded by detailed studies of the problems arising in the application of international instruments in this field, and by a massive campaign to arouse public opinion. This conference could make an assessment of what has been done nationally and internationally in application of the Hague Convention and other Unesco conventions and recommendations regarding the protection of cultural property, and could determine the priority measures needed to attain the objectives laid down by them.

25. The experts also felt that 14 May 1984, the thirtieth anniversary of the Convention's adoption, should be marked by a commemorative ceremony at which the Director-General could make an appeal to all Member States, encouraging those that had not yet become parties to the Convention to do so and reminding the Contracting Parties of their commitments.

26. The Director-General decided to take action on this suggestion, and on 14 May 1984 a ceremony was held at Unesco Headquarters in celebration of the thirtieth anniversary of the Hague Convention of 1954. Those present at the ceremony included members of the Executive Board, members of the permanent delegations to Unesco, representatives of interested French and international organizations, and media representatives. After an introduction by Mr Patrick K. Seddoh, Chairman of the Executive Board of Unesco, speeches were made by Mr Amadou-Mahtar M'Bow, Director-General of the Organization, Dr Manfred Lachs and Mr Nagendra Singh, judges at the International Court of Justice, and Mr Vadim Elisseeff, Director of the Musée Guimet in Paris. This ceremony was an opportunity to stress how desirable it would be to give a fresh impetus to the implementation of the Convention. To bring the speeches made on that occasion to the knowledge of all Member States, the text of each is reproduced below.

Address by Mr Patrick K. Seddoh,
Chairman of the Executive Board of Unesco
at the celebration of the thirtieth anniversary
of the Hague Convention

Mr Director-General,
Members of the Executive Board,
Ladies and Gentlemen,

It is for me an honour and a privilege to be able to make a few introductory remarks at this solemn commemoration of the thirtieth anniversary of the Hague Convention, and to be preceding such a distinguished group of speakers.

Throughout history, countless cities have crumbled and burned under enemy fire, and with them, all that civilization has made possible, especially our cultural heritage which has been painstakingly preserved over the centuries. Just over four decades ago Dresden, Coventry, Montecassino and Warsaw were among the victims of such catastrophic destruction. In more recent times, Angkor Vat, Tyre and many others have added their names to this tragic reckoning.

Man's inhumanity to man brings untold death and human suffering in its wake. But this is not all. War and acts of military aggression also impoverish the collective memory of mankind, destroying masterpieces of his creative genius and laying waste to the built environment of his towns and cities.

Such wanton destruction is particularly horrifying in our time, for an acute concern for the protection of our heritage characterizes our contemporary cultural awareness.

Here this evening, we are commemorating a great and memorable date in the emergence of this awareness, one which has in turn nurtured the sense of a shared responsibility for protecting the cultural patrimony of mankind.

No institution has contributed more than Unesco to the creation and strengthening of this sense of responsibility. It is true to say, in fact, that the first piece of international legislation which launched this gradual process was the Convention signed on 14 May 1954 at the Hague by fifty-six Member States of Unesco, namely the Final Act of the Intergovernmental Conference on the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict.

By requiring that the contracting States undertake to respect the integrity of cultural property within their own territory as well as within that of other contracting States and, in the event of their occupying any territory of another contracting State, to co-operate with the latter in order to ensure the safeguard of all

cultural property, the Convention laid the basis for international solidarity in favour of a common heritage.

A significant innovation in international law was the creation of an International Register of Cultural Property under Special Protection, to be kept by the Director-General of Unesco, and in which may be entered, and I quote, 'a limited number of refuges intended to shelter movable cultural property in the event of armed conflict of centres containing monuments and other immovable cultural property of very great importance'.

Many other Conventions and Recommendations were to follow, forming the increasingly comprehensive system of international standards elaborated by our Organization. Among these the Convention of 1954, now popularly known as the 'Hague Convention', has struck a particularly responsive chord within us.

The reasons are not far to seek. Since the dream of Unesco's founders seems yet so far from becoming a reality, wars may still continue, alas, wars may begin in the minds of men. And, what is more, as the destructive power of contemporary military technology daily assumes more awesome proportions, the cultural price to be paid in the event of armed conflict becomes too terrible to contemplate.

It is a matter of concern and much regret, therefore, that to date, only seventy-one States have become Parties to the Hague Convention, that so few States appear to have been able to take the measures necessary even in peacetime, and that the system of international control established by the Convention has been applied only once. But I will not dwell on these shortcomings, or be daunted by these disappointed hopes. Their causes and effects will be far more ably explored by the Director-General and the other distinguished speakers who will be addressing our gathering here this evening.

This anniversary which also falls during a time of introspection for the Organization as a whole, is a fitting moment to assess the results of thirty years of implementation of the Hague Convention. And, on the basis of this stock-taking, to strive anew to make the fullest possible use of this indispensable international instrument. To do otherwise would be to betray the trust of those who, decades ago, brought an end to a great and terrible war and founded Unesco in order to ensure the protection of our common heritage.

Address by Mr Amadou-Mahtar M'Bow,
Director-General of Unesco,
at the celebration of the thirtieth anniversary
of the Hague Convention

Ladies and Gentlemen,

We have gathered here today to celebrate the thirtieth anniversary of the Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict, approved on 14 May 1954 by the Intergovernmental Conference convened by Unesco at The Hague.

This Convention is the culmination of the many efforts that were made throughout the twentieth century to prevent the destruction of unique historic or artistic treasures by armed conflict. The Hague Conventions of 1899 and 1907 had already stated that damage to cultural property could not be justified by war. In 1935, a Pact for the Protection of Artistic and Scientific Institutions and of Historic Monuments was signed in Washington by the American States. The League of Nations also tried to work out an international system for the protection of cultural property.

However, the international community did not manage to complete this task until after the Second World War. Unesco was founded in 1945 with the mission of assuring 'the conservation and protection of the world's inheritance of books, works of art and monuments of history and science'.

As early as at the fourth session, in 1949, the General Conference was giving thought to the question of 'the protection of all objects of cultural value, particularly those kept in museums, libraries and archives, against the probable consequences of armed conflict'.

The matter was considered many times by the General Conference and the Executive Board, by the International Council of Museums and the Unesco International Committee on Monuments, Artistic and Historical Sites and Archaeological Excavations. This Committee prepared a draft Convention which was revised by a working group set up by the General Conference. It was then sent to all Unesco's Member States before finally being submitted to the Conference at The Hague.

Recognizing that monuments and cultural masterpieces had suffered tremendous damage during the Second World War and that with technological development they were in increasing danger of destruction, the High Contracting Parties to the Convention undertook 'to respect cultural property situated within their own territory as well as within the territory of other High

Contracting Parties by refraining from any use of the property and its immediate surroundings or of the appliances in use for its protection for purposes which are likely to expose it to destruction or damage in the event of armed conflict; and by refraining from any act of hostility directed against such property'.

The Hague Convention thus provides the first integrated series of measures for the safeguarding of the world cultural heritage. The definition of this heritage is particularly extensive, covering movable or immovable cultural property ranging from monuments to works of art and from museums to manuscripts. The scope of application of the Convention is also very wide and comprises all kinds of armed conflicts, including foreign occupation, and war in which the state of war is not recognized by one of the parties.

Those who drafted the Convention were concerned to overturn the main political or legal arguments that might be put forward to impede application of the Convention. We might mention as an example the provisions concerning military training and public information in peacetime or those requiring the States Parties to provide, in their municipal law, for the prevention or punishment of breaches of the Convention.

The Convention further sets out, in great detail, provisions concerning the granting of 'special protection' to certain refuges for the shelter of movable cultural property, to centres containing monuments, or to immovable cultural property of great value. Provision is made for its entry in a special international register, and the methods and procedures to be followed in the identification of such property, its entry in the register, or its cancellation are also stated.

Finally, provision is made in the Convention and the regulations governing its execution for a system of international control calling for the appointment of delegates, Commissioners-General for Cultural Property, and even inspectors and experts to solve certain particularly difficult problems involved in the Convention's application.

Thus by tackling the specific problems raised by the protection of the cultural heritage and by laying down practical measures to solve them, the authors of the Hague Convention produced an instrument particularly well suited to its purpose.

Great efforts are still required, however, if the measures advocated are to take full effect on

a world scale. So far, seventy-one States have acceded to the Convention or accepted it. The 'International Register of Cultural Property under Special Protection' comprises, besides the Vatican, only eight refuges, which are situated on the territory of three States Parties.

On the occasion of a number of armed conflicts between States Parties, or of conflicts not of a generally recognized international character, my predecessors and myself have reminded the parties of the need for applying the provisions of the Convention and have mentioned the possibility of Unesco's technical co-operation. Several of these States have shown willingness to honour their undertakings. However, Unesco's technical assistance, provided for in Article 23, has been sought on only three occasions.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

The Hague Convention opened up a particularly effective channel for international understanding and co-operation. It added to and strengthened the standards restraining the use of force in the event of armed conflict and was for this reason regarded as an essential part of humanitarian law by the diplomatic Conference on the reaffirmation and development of international humanitarian

law applicable in the event of armed conflict, which met in Geneva from 1974 to 1977.

The Convention also introduced new ideas such as that of a universal cultural heritage and that of the preservation of that heritage for future generations. It has thus served as a basis for the many campaigns organized by Unesco to save monuments all over the world and has been extended by further international conventions, in particular the 1972 Convention for the protection of the world cultural and natural heritage.

The Hague Convention is therefore more than ever of topical interest. This is why it is important to give fresh impetus to its implementation.

The celebration which has brought us together today could be an occasion for Member States which have not yet done so to deposit instruments of ratification of the Convention, and for those which have already deposited such instruments to do what is needed to ensure more systematic and more effective protection of the cultural heritage of mankind.

By working together to preserve property which is their common treasure, nations learn to recognize what unites them, over and above what sets them against each other, and are in a better position to make the values of mutual respect, tolerance and fellowship prevail among them in all fields.

Address by Dr Manfred Lachs,
Judge at the International Court of Justice,
at the celebration of the thirtieth anniversary
of the Hague Convention

Mr Chairman of the Executive Board,
Mr Director-General,
Your Excellencies,
Ladies and Gentlemen,

Like others on this platform, I rise before you tonight to address myself to some aspects of two domains which seem to be in obvious contradiction: culture and war. The first, an essential part of our existence, enriches our lives - the other, tantamount to destruction, continues to disturb our lives. I recall it to you, on this special occasion - the anniversary of today. Anniversaries are rather stultifying occasions; one often resorts to facile clichés, indulges in generalities. However, recalling tonight the Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict, I wish to take a different and much wider approach.

While man's yearning for peace has been his innermost desire from time immemorial, his march through history has, as we all know, been accompanied by frequent armed struggle. Looking back over a period of thirty-five centuries, less than three hundred years have been free from wars. The search for wealth, plunder and domination, but also the goal of freedom and independence, have motivated man's resort to armed force. Little need be said of the destructive effect of wars on all continents or of the misery and death brought in their wake. They have become part of our lives, unfortunately, and are viewed as inescapable. Armies have become important parts of societies - war itself is considered an art and is so described by historians. Obviously it has been the arch-enemy of culture and civilization particularly when ravaging whole countries, destroying men and what human labour and spirit has tried to build for centuries.

Hence the continuous efforts made throughout history to make war disappear from its pages; to make it only a part of the past. We have made some progress in this respect. We have outlawed war, but not very successfully. Even after the gigantic destruction caused by the Second World War we have witnessed so many armed struggles. While trying to abolish war we try to make it more humane, to limit its destructive possibilities. It is true that sceptics express serious doubts as to the value and effect of these efforts. To remind you only of Moltke's famous letter to Bluntschli

and the Portalis memoire to the Academy of Toulouse. And the letter published in the London Times in 1869, in which a famous Cambridge professor said: 'To attempt to disarm war of its horrors is an idle dream and a dangerous delusion; let us labour at the more practical task of making it impossible'.

However this practical task has proved almost impossible. We must therefore make war more humane, a task initiated by great men like Dr Francis Lieber, Jean Gaspard Bluntschli and Antoine Pillet - followed by the adoption of a series of international instruments and the Convention mentioned to you by the Director-General of Unesco who spoke so eloquently before me. For it is rightly claimed that there is 'nothing illogical in trying to eliminate war and to regulate its conduct'. Thus we must pursue our efforts to achieve the goal of a world without war - and meanwhile try to limit the ravages of reality whenever and wherever we have to face them.

The call for protection went beyond men in uniform, the wounded, prisoners of war and civilians, to objects requiring special attention. Have we made progress in this respect? I think we have, and the first inklings to this effect are to be found in the earlier work done at The Hague and Washington. But the Convention concluded thirty years ago under the auspices of Unesco, the thirtieth anniversary of which we are celebrating tonight, constitutes in this respect a very special event.

First, it reminded man that the culture of nations is the most precious jewel he possesses. Not only royal mausolea, not only mummies saved by history and accident; but the real cultural monuments: towers, castles and churches - from the stone tombs, the Stonehenge which had been built and rebuilt before the Mycenaean civilization began in Greece; developed in the ages of the Gothic Renaissance, Baroque, up to yesterday. Here as elsewhere the eurocentric approach is outdated; we are bound to think in worldwide dimensions. It is through war and other careless actions that many treasures of culture on other continents were destroyed or few traces left. Whether or not these monuments bear testimony of what some historians describe as 'sun and light' or 'dusk and darkness', they reflect the history of nations.

This leads me to the second subject, namely history, and the Convention of 1954. History,

need I stress, history is a very precious part of our lives. By condemning history, we condemn it to oblivion and make nations lose their identity. History, as Jules Michelet rightly claimed: 'Cette grande épopée nous est donnée sur les tombes, murmures des âges s'adressant au fond de chacun de nous, afin qu'il s'y reconnaisse et ce serait là, signe et critère de vérité historique'. What I have in mind is the eternal silence created by the destruction of culture. As Michelet continued: 'Adieu le passé, c'est aussi adieu la postérité'. Here is a second element which is so essential in preserving works of culture of the past.

The third is the recognition that the cultural heritage of every people taken together constitutes the cultural heritage of mankind as a whole. The Director-General of Unesco, speaking before me, stressed very wisely the importance of this notion. It is the heritage belonging to us all. In protecting the past culture of others we protect our own, part of the whole. Here lies the great symbolic meaning of that achievement which was the Convention concluded thirty years ago. I think we have matured enough to realize the meaning of the words in that Convention: 'Damage to cultural property belonging to any people means damage to the heritage of all mankind'.

Thus it is this Convention which, for the first time, uses the legal notion of common heritage of mankind in the domain of culture - embodied in so many forms. That great historian Jacob Burckhard once claimed that culture and State were entirely different phenomena, and culture must not be submitted to power - he saw in their link an evil, an evil to be avoided. But obviously it is threatened. Who can protect culture if not the State? It is the power of the State which has to yield to culture, by protecting it. That is the great importance of the Convention of 1954 which extends the boundaries of culture into the domain of international relations, and brings the notion of the 'cultural heritage of mankind' into the legal dictionary which, with the passage of time, has been enriched by other concepts of common heritage: outer space and the ocean floor. This, I think, is Unesco's great achievement on which I wish to congratulate it: it has made culture a legal notion.

Though a lawyer, so far I have spoken little of law, but it should not be surprising, because when you speak of culture you mean law. For law itself is a meaningful part of culture; it is called upon to defend it. For the real meaning of its task is to help history to recover and rescue what is or may be in danger. But there is much more to it: history and culture are closely interwoven with each other and their fate is linked with law.

The Convention is very explicit on the subject. It lays down, you will recall, the prohibition of direct hostilities against objects of culture. To breathe life into it - to make it what it should be - is, Mr Director-General, your great task.

The protection of cultural property has become part of the generally accepted laws of warfare - whether it is international or not of an international character. These provisions should

have become new chapters in military instructions and manuals of the laws of warfare distributed to members of the armed forces. Consequently respect for property becomes part of man's education. It is interesting to note how here, as in other areas, the functions and tasks of Unesco overlap. The Convention is not only an instrument binding States but its continuous operation implies teaching, so essential in shaping the minds of man and nations to reach beyond the subject, the destiny of the international community. Thus in all three spheres which I referred to, the Convention should penetrate the minds of hundreds of thousands, make them realize its importance; and Unesco's future work is essential for the fulfilment of this task.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

It is of course very unfortunate that the Convention we are recalling today has been subscribed to by only the limited number of States mentioned by the Director-General. But it is my firm conviction that while the technical and procedural provisions may remain rules binding the parties only, the basic principles may have become principles recognized by the international community as a whole. Thus there is an implied duty on other States to ratify this Convention as ratifying something which has become law. Here I find the rules binding and binding *erga omnes*.

Let me therefore, Ladies and Gentlemen, before concluding, recall one of the Unesco Constitution's fundamental passages: 'to build in the minds of men the defences of peace' and paraphrase it 'to build in them the defences of culture' - the values to be cherished by all nations. To make law truly effective, we must build in the minds of men the conviction that compliance with the rules of law lies in their own vital interest, for knowledge is important. It does not solve problems but it sows the seeds of wisdom and paves the way to their solution. It is 'apprendre à comprendre'. Hence knowledge of this Convention would lead to its application. It is not only governments which, by their power, should enforce the law, but the people who have to realize their role, take a critical look at their own compliance with the law and see whether it is adequate. If not, they ought to make a greater effort to learn more and more and more of the need for compliance with the law.

Mr Chairman, it is reported that Alexander the Great, while on military expeditions, travelled with the works of Homer under his pillow. It is also reported that King Gustav Adolf of Sweden, on his military expeditions, kept Grotius's work *De Jure Belli ac Pacis* under his pillow. May I suggest that every statesman and every military man take the text of the Convention of 1954 under his pillow and think of it in the day and dream of it at night, until king and commoner help to reach the real goal that means a warless world. We have to try and make effective the guarantee that where conflict arises and comes about it should be limited to the bare necessities between armies and should save not only civilians but cultures and civilizations and thus man's great achievements from oblivion.

Address by Mr Nagendra Singh,
Judge at the International Court of Justice,
at the celebration of the thirtieth anniversary
of the Hague Convention

Distinguished members of the Executive Board,
Esteemed Director-General,
Your Excellencies,
Ladies and Gentlemen,

May I say at the very outset how greatly privileged I feel to stand here on the Unesco platform and speak to you on an important subject which relates to the protection of the cultural heritage of mankind.

There are several reasons why one's enthusiasm is heightened when speaking to this august assemblage. First of all, it is a pleasure to address oneself to a subject of such inspiring character; secondly, to be associated with the anniversary celebrations of a salutary Treaty such as The Protection of Cultural Property in Case of Armed Conflict; and, thirdly, to speak on a Convention which takes its name from The Hague, the city of the International Court of Justice where I work.

The Hague Convention of 1954 is a landmark in the history of human effort to identify, preserve and protect the inheritance of man - so valuable and precious as to constitute the very base of our civilization as it has gradually evolved through the centuries from the hoary past. In this connection, Unesco has rendered meritorious service and is still doing so today by all the means and methods in its power, ranging from providing technical advice, wherever it is needed, monetary assistance and supervisory help to the holding of conferences of sovereign States in order to make them aware of their duty in relation to what has been built up as our culture and heritage, so as to fully profit from it in the future. In this regard, Unesco's contribution has been quite remarkable, and this world body has placed humanity under a deep debt and everlasting gratitude.

Having first addressed myself to the coveted Unesco patronage and what it has achieved, may I now say something about the Hague Convention of 1954, the anniversary of which we are celebrating here today. As the objects which represent and symbolize the heritage of mankind all over the world are so precious, being irreplaceable, it becomes the bounden duty of every man and every State to protect and preserve them at all costs. Since the greatest threat to those valuable objects comes from armed conflict, a

multilateral convention was drawn up in 1954 for the protection of cultural property. As mentioned before by previous speakers, including the distinguished Director-General, this Convention has been recognized as an essential element of international humanitarian law. It is in fact the only useful instrument which the international community has sponsored for this particular purpose; and this fact was affirmed in resolution 20 of the Geneva Diplomatic Conference of 1977.

Looking at the disturbing increase of violence and the number of armed conflicts besetting the world today, our reliance on this Convention is much greater today than ever before. As such, the 1954 Convention has to be looked at anew to see how best it can be rendered more effective in order to match the ever-increasing problems which have cropped up throughout the world. Unesco has addressed itself to this aspect of the matter and, in October 1983, a meeting of experts was convened in Vienna, which I had the great privilege to attend. In this connection, while emphasizing the urgent need for obtaining more ratifications and greater adherence to this Convention, I have the following submissions to make.

First of all, before we embark on erecting superstructures, it is essential to know that the base foundation is a sound one. In that respect, I have no hesitation in saying that the 1954 Convention, as it stands today, is a good and useful instrument, having salutary provisions for a sound base on which to build an effective structure for the protection and preservation of cultural objects which make up our heritage.

This may be a good opportunity to bring out some of the worthy and significant provisions of the Convention which may be regarded as its distinguishing characteristics to inspire confidence in the Convention itself. For example, in Article 4, paragraph (5) it stipulates that:

'No High Contracting Party may evade the obligations incumbent upon it under the present Article, in respect of another High Contracting Party, by reason of the fact that the latter has not applied the measures of safeguard referred to in Article 3.'

This provision indicates that the intention of the Treaty is to close loopholes or gaps through which a Party to the Treaty could escape.

It should be the spirit of the Convention to comply strictly with the arrangements to protect

all cultural property. Similarly, by virtue of Article 18, the present Convention is made applicable in the event of declared war or of any other armed conflict, even if the state of war is not recognized by one or more of the Parties. Furthermore, in Clause 3 of Article 18 it is said:

'If one of the Powers in conflict is not a Party to the present Convention, the Powers which are Parties thereto shall nevertheless remain bound by it in their mutual relations'.

The intention, very rightly, is to extend the Convention in its sphere of application and thus to prevent any escape clause to undermine the obligations of protection.

In addition, Article 26, at paragraph 2, prescribes a very healthy reporting system by which every State, at least once every four years, has to forward to the Director-General a report giving whatever information they think suitable concerning any measures being taken, prepared or contemplated by their respective administrations in fulfilment of the present Convention. There are several such healthy clauses which make the Convention beneficial by rendering it effective in different circumstances of the case.

In spite of the aforesaid provisions, it is to be admitted that the effectiveness of any Treaty depends on the will of the Parties to respect and enforce it. For example, the reporting system prescribed by Article 26(2) as I read out just now, is a welcome measure, if it is complied with. Unfortunately, quite a number of Parties to the Treaty have not complied with this provision and there has been a general lack of interest in the care and attention which was originally witnessed by the international community for the protection of cultural property. Therefore there may be room for tightening up the Convention in certain respects by giving more power to the Director-General of Unesco to insist on these periodical reports and to make suggestions which the Contracting Parties would be required to implement.

Furthermore, there is a need to make the Parties to the Convention generally more interested in order to inspire them to enforce the Convention through their local agencies. It has been found that States have lost some interest in the Convention. This is evidenced by fewer ratifications being registered during recent years and fewer periodical reports being received by Unesco. This is creating the impression that many of the measures foreseen by this benign Treaty have not been taken.

On the whole, the group which met in Vienna in October 1983, felt that, to ensure the desired effectiveness of the 1954 Convention, Unesco should organize, at an opportune time, a conference

which would bring together all Member States of the Organization to discuss what measures States should take by internal legislation to protect the human heritage in the event of armed conflict.

In order to reach the objectives foreseen in these Unesco instruments concerning cultural property, it would appear necessary to list the appropriate measures which each State should undertake and to report to Unesco on the compliance of such measures. Moreover, there should be education of the masses to respect and to volunteer to preserve the cultural heritage of mankind. All activities to increase the interest of governments and to build up public opinion and public support are very essential for the fulfilment of the objectives and purposes of the Convention concerning cultural property. It would be a great advantage to have national associations voluntarily brought into existence to support the Convention.

For example, each country has its own objects of art, architecture and literature which make up its national heritage. If school and university education in each State could highlight those objects by including them in educational curricula and build up a hallow of sanctity around them, it would undoubtedly create a general spirit of pride in such objects and thus the desire to protect them.

In short, there should be a campaign organized in each nation State to encourage the establishment of national consultative committees and organizations, both voluntary and government-inspired, as well as the creation of private and public associations to help protect all cultural property.

National consultative committees were visualized in Resolution 2 of the Hague Convention of 1954; similarly, private associations to help in the same direction were also envisaged. But it is doubtful if any State has taken action to promote these instrumentalities, including the most important one, that of educating the masses, through school and university curricula, on the knowledge and existence of such cultural objects and properties which make up their national heritage and, consequently, the world's heritage.

The distinguished Director-General of Unesco has rendered a great service in organizing this anniversary celebration to remind us of the existence of the 1954 Convention and its ancillary instruments in order to awaken mankind to the increasing threat to the very existence of those objects, of which humanity could and should be forever proud.

I sincerely wish all success to the efforts of the Director-General and of Unesco in attaining these objectives.

Address by Mr Vadim Elisseeff,
Curator in Chief of the Musée Guimet,
at the celebration of the thirtieth anniversary
of the Hague Convention

Mr Director-General,
Members of the Executive Board,
Your Excellencies,
Ladies and Gentlemen,

You have done me the honour, Mr Chairman, of inviting me to this commemoration, and I must express my thanks to you at the outset. As you know, I consider myself to be almost one of the family, since, fourteen years ago now, in 1970, you were good enough to call on me, with my modest abilities, to act as a grass-roots militant to have the convention applied when an armed conflict arose.

At that time, sixty or so States had acceded and a certain slowdown was already making itself felt in the rate of ratifications. Yet we all feel that, as has been mentioned several times, tensions are not slackening; we all feel that the dangers are the same as they were thirty years ago and are certainly greater in some regions.

But an old fear - almost a taboo - always makes us draw back when faced with the possibility of catastrophe. We too often behave like ostriches. We practical people are asked to make such an effort, Mr Chairman, that its scale sometimes appals us, and sometimes simply paralyses us.

Certainly, Mr Chairman, the ultimate aim of this Convention should be kept as it is: to save cultural property from war. But we should also untiringly remind ourselves that nearly all the measures provided for contribute to the proper conservation of cultural property everywhere and at all times, in both war and peace. It is even more difficult to define 'armed conflict' today than it was in the past. There is a continuous area of danger surrounding all the circumstances of everyday life, from an unexpectedly unleashed nuclear cataclysm to a carelessly discarded cigarette-end, not to mention the damage done by terrorism, the effects of looting, or individual acts of madness like the burning of the library in Alexandria in antiquity or, more recently, the 'vandal of the Vatican'.

The state of armed conflict is, as we can see, an extreme state, perhaps like an epidemic. We have long been familiar with medical comparisons from the field of war studies, and I never

fail to remind my students and trainees that the only difference between a museum and a hospital is that our patients don't scream. They nevertheless have just as much need of nursing, hygiene, care and surveillance, chemicals and operations. Cultural property is not inert and we know the harm done by rust and the diseases of stone and bronze.

Mr Chairman, our cultural heritage is a living thing and to consider it as such is, already, to accept its permanent need for solicitude on our part. To guard it against catastrophes small and large, human and natural, is to work for the convention's final objective - the survival of our heritage. What good is legislation if in peacetime, even before there is any conflict, the treasures suffer or die, burned in fires, crushed when buildings collapse, jarred by the vibrations of noisy machines or polluted by the use of toxic chemicals, not to mention the ageing of organic foundation materials.

I cannot enumerate, Mr Chairman, all the things the Director-General and his Secretariat have done, have been doing for a long time, to counter these problems, nor all the meetings of experts, all the symposia organized under the aegis of non-governmental organizations like ICOM and ICOMOS.

Many recommendations exist, but in spite of the exemplary efforts of some countries, they are sometimes impossible to apply for lack of resources, and they are sometimes not applied for lack of consensus. This structure of studies and advisory work needs a keystone transcending all instruments. This keystone exists, Mr Chairman, and I believe it to be precisely the Hague Convention, which is supported by a long tradition going back to the late nineteenth century. The drafters of the 1954 document put together an extremely flexible instrument, all of whose proposals are applicable in peacetime and cover the measures essential for giving cultural property every chance of survival.

Just setting up the emergency arrangements, for example, implies a study of packing and transport (which ought in fact to be of constant interest when there are exhibitions, even today); the preparation and equipping of refuges (which even in peacetime can provide very sound storage

space; measures against fire, which as everyone knows is a constant danger. To organize these emergency measures demands, it must be said at once, meticulous preparation at the technical, administrative and human levels, giving each person a full awareness of their role and, above all, the stimulus of professionalism, vital in the work of protection.

Alongside this, the making of inventories of important items of cultural property should go hand in hand with registration as a unique means of providing a check-up, making it possible, very often, to detect the tiny beginnings of deterioration, which can easily be halted in its initial stages, sometimes simply by a better environment.

Behind these examples we can all see how the conservation of cultural property can be improved as of now. One must, I think, accept a policy of vaccination before the epidemic - that is to say the immediate application, everywhere, of the Convention. In 1970, my colleague Mr Noblecourt and I were ourselves able to see how much precious time could have been saved had all these practical measures - setting up the responsible committees, special protection corps, drawing up maps, lists, plans, administrative co-operation agreements - been taken in advance instead of having to be taken in the heat of the moment. We must remember, too, that an object ravaged by time and suffering from lack of care very rapidly becomes twice as fragile, and the cost of protecting it multiplies. As in all other fields, ladies and gentlemen, any preventive measure saves not only time but also money and energy.

In short, Mr Chairman, I believe we have here a fine instrument which we scarcely use, always waiting for the premonitory signs of a tragic tomorrow. May I, under these circumstances, put forward a few hopes: long live the Convention - but, I repeat, we must now, at once, in a practical way, give it a new impetus, whatever the cost, at both national and international levels.

At the national level one should perhaps consider, for example, extensive joint consultations between all the bodies concerned in safeguarding our cultural heritage: the administrative, military, educational and school authorities as well as professional and private organizations. These consultations should be vigorously supported by steps to arouse public opinion, obviously through the mass media.

Internationally, we could perhaps envisage closer co-operation among those countries which have acceded to the Convention, and especially between those which have, sadly, been through war and those, more fortunate, which have not. This could perhaps be through an exchange of views on the application of the Convention - such exchanges being in fact provided for in Article 27.

Qualified representatives could organize regular contacts among themselves, to deal as quickly as possible with what is certainly the heart of the Convention - Articles 6 and 9 on special protection. This provision, the key to the Convention, offers States the best example of security by placing the safeguarding of their cultural property under international control; yet I believe that to date, Mr Chairman, only four States out of the seventy-one which are Parties to the Convention have taken advantage of this.

A new debate should herald a new momentum, leading to new entries in the International Register. In this field, international co-operation can only be carried on through a wide exchange of information leading, where appropriate, to a transfer of technical know-how by means of meetings of experts and, especially, by the distribution of specialized publications.

These, among other things, are what I would wish for, Mr Chairman. Many of my colleagues around the world are ready, but the decision-makers need to be urged forward and public opinion aroused.

For my part, Mr Chairman, I can clearly see a way of co-ordinating this action. At this point I would like to turn to you, Mr Director-General, to make my proposal. Would it not be possible, despite the restrictions, to strengthen the International Standards Department a little? This would be a response to the importance we specialists attach to this work, and it would show that behind the dry title of 'International Standards' lies the true key to our problems. Perhaps a new name ought to be found for this department to remove its incognito, as it were, since it is life itself. This is the department which is responsible for the essentials of cultural heritage protection, and hence for that heritage itself. No one in the world can deny the great importance of it as defined by the Hague Convention, the thirtieth anniversary of which we are celebrating, and which I hope will see many centenaries without any conflict.

CONVENTION AND PROTOCOL FOR THE PROTECTION OF CULTURAL PROPERTY
IN THE EVENT OF ARMED CONFLICT
(The Hague, 14 May 1954)

List of States having deposited an instrument of ratification or accession
as of 1 September 1984

<u>States</u>	<u>Convention</u>	<u>Protocol</u>
	Date of deposit of ratification (R) or accession (A)	Date of deposit of ratification (R) or accession (A)
Albania	20. 12. 1960 (A)	20. 12. 1960 (A)
Austria	25. 03. 1964 (R)	25. 03. 1964 (R)
Belgium	16. 09. 1960 (R)	16. 09. 1960 (R)
Brazil	12. 09. 1958 (R)	12. 09. 1958 (R)
Bulgaria	7. 08. 1956 (A)	9. 10. 1958 (A)
Burkina-Faso	18. 12. 1969 (A)	-
Burma	10. 02. 1956 (R)	10. 02. 1956 (R)
Byelorussian SSR	7. 05. 1957 (R)	7. 05. 1957 (R)
Cuba	26. 11. 1957 (R)	26. 11. 1957 (R)
Cyprus	9. 09. 1964 (A)	9. 09. 1964 (A)
Czechoslovakia	6. 12. 1957 (R)	6. 12. 1957 (R)
Democratic Kampuchea	4. 04. 1962 (R)	4. 04. 1962 (R)
Democratic Yemen	6. 02. 1970 (A)	6. 02. 1970 (A)
Dominican Republic	5. 01. 1960 (A)	-
Ecuador	2. 10. 1956 (R)	8. 02. 1961 (R)
Egypt	17. 08. 1955 (R)	17. 08. 1955 (R)
France	7. 06. 1957 (R)	7. 06. 1957 (R)
Gabon	4. 12. 1961 (A)	4. 12. 1961 (A)
German Democratic Republic	16. 01. 1974 (A)	16. 01. 1974 (A)
Germany, Federal Republic of	11. 08. 1967 (R)	11. 08. 1967 (R)
Ghana	25. 07. 1960 (A)	25. 07. 1960 (A)
Greece	9. 02. 1981 (R)	9. 02. 1981 (R)
Guinea	20. 09. 1960 (A)	11. 12. 1961 (A)
Holy See	24. 02. 1958 (A)	24. 02. 1958 (A)
Hungary	17. 05. 1956 (R)	16. 08. 1956 (A)
India	16. 06. 1958 (R)	16. 06. 1958 (R)
Indonesia	10. 01. 1967 (R)	26. 07. 1967 (R)
Iran	22. 06. 1959 (R)	22. 06. 1959 (R)
Iraq	21. 12. 1967 (R)	21. 12. 1967 (R)
Israel	3. 10. 1957 (R)	1. 04. 1958 (A)
Italy	9. 05. 1958 (R)	9. 05. 1958 (R)
Ivory Coast	24. 01. 1980 (A)	-
Jordan	2. 10. 1957 (R)	2. 10. 1957 (R)
Kuwait	6. 06. 1969 (A)	11. 02. 1970 (A)
Lebanon	1. 06. 1960 (R)	1. 06. 1960 (R)
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	19. 11. 1957 (R)	19. 11. 1957 (R)

<u>States</u>	<u>Convention</u>	<u>Protocol</u>
	Date of deposit of ratification (R) or accession (A)	Date of deposit of ratification (R) or accession (A)
Liechtenstein	28. 04. 1960 (A)	28. 04. 1960 (A)
Luxembourg	29. 09. 1961 (R)	29. 09. 1961 (R)
Madagascar	3. 11. 1961 (A)	3. 11. 1961 (A)
Malaysia	12. 12. 1960 (A)	12. 12. 1960 (A)
Mali	18. 05. 1961 (A)	18. 05. 1961 (A)
Mexico	7. 05. 1956 (R)	7. 05. 1956 (R)
Monaco	10. 12. 1957 (R)	10. 12. 1957 (R)
Mongolia	4. 11. 1964 (A)	-
Morocco	30. 08. 1968 (A)	30. 08. 1968 (A)
Netherlands	14. 10. 1958 (R)	14. 10. 1958 (R)
Nicaragua	25. 11. 1959 (R)	25. 11. 1959 (R)
Niger	6. 12. 1976 (A)	6. 12. 1976 (A)
Nigeria	5. 06. 1961 (A)	5. 06. 1961 (A)
Norway	19. 09. 1961 (R)	19. 09. 1961 (R)
Oman	26. 10. 1977 (A)	-
Pakistan	27. 03. 1959 (A)	27. 03. 1959 (A)
Panama	17. 07. 1962 (A)	-
Poland	6. 08. 1956 (R)	6. 08. 1956 (R)
Qatar	31. 07. 1973 (A)	-
Romania	21. 03. 1958 (R)	21. 03. 1958 (A)
San Marino	9. 02. 1956 (R)	9. 02. 1956 (R)
Saudi Arabia	20. 01. 1971 (A)	-
Spain	7. 07. 1960 (R)	-
Sudan	23. 07. 1970 (A)	-
Switzerland	15. 05. 1962 (A)	15. 05. 1962 (A)
Syrian Arab Republic	6. 03. 1958 (R)	6. 03. 1958 (R)
Thailand	2. 05. 1958 (A)	2. 05. 1958 (A)
Tunisia	28. 01. 1981 (A)	28. 01. 1981 (A)
Turkey	15. 12. 1965 (A)	15. 12. 1965 (A)
Ukrainian SSR	6. 02. 1957 (R)	6. 02. 1957 (R)
USSR	4. 01. 1957 (R)	4. 01. 1957 (R)
United Republic of Cameroon	12. 10. 1961 (A)	12. 10. 1961 (A)
United Republic of Tanzania	23. 09. 1971 (A)	-
Yugoslavia	13. 02. 1956 (R)	13. 02. 1956 (R)
Zaire	18. 04. 1961 (A)	18. 04. 1961 (A)

REPORTS FROM HIGH CONTRACTING PARTIES TO THE CONVENTION

AUSTRIA

In implementation of all the provisions of the Hague Convention on the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict, Austria's efforts to safeguard its cultural heritage and ensure that it is cared for have been pursued consistently over the past four years.

As before, the Convention's aims fall within the immediate jurisdiction of the Federal Ministry of Science and Research, since this Ministry is also responsible for everything concerning the protection of monuments in general. Practical measures in the civilian sphere remain within the jurisdiction of the Bundesdenkmalamt (the authority responsible in Austria for historic monuments) under its statutes (decree of the Federal Ministry of Science and Research, 31 July 1981, Bulletin of Decrees published by the Ministries of Education and the Arts, Science and Research; No. 100, 1981) as a subordinate department of the Federal Ministry of Science and Research.

One of the main points of the Bundesdenkmalamt's programme of work over the past few years has been an intensified census of Austria's cultural heritage. Among other things, the inventory of cultural property has been completed, reshaped and brought up to date. The emphasis has been on the Federal provinces of Burgenland, Carinthia, Lower Austria, Salzburg, Styria and Vorarlberg. All existing lists of classified monuments have been re-examined (they are constantly re-examined by appropriate means) and revised as and where necessary. The lists of classified monuments in the Carinthia and Vorarlberg Federal provinces have been fully entered on computer files, and this process is continuing steadily.

To complete the inventory of cultural property, which at present contains 76,890 objects, an item-by-item census has also been made of those objects which are part of the interior decoration of monasteries, convents, churches, etc. The Bundesdenkmalamt has also made maps of the protected cultural property. One hundred and seventy-eight of the planned 213 maps have already been published.

Maps to a scale of 1:200 have been made of the protection zones in cities, towns and villages, and some have been published.

Priority has also been given to continuing with the drawing up of the alarm file, a particularly important working instrument in the event of imminent danger.

The central data inventory is a safety file for all items, containing a card for every object with all the information (text and pictures) the Bundesdenkmalamt has been able to gather. It is now being completed by duplicating existing documents on Vorarlberg and Carinthia. For cultural property in Lower Austria 7,700 records have been compiled containing the Bundesdenkmalamt's archives and indexes in the form of references, photocopies or microfilm.

As regards the marking of registered cultural property, eight of the nine provinces have obtained plaques with the International Convention emblem, and the related approval documents for the most important objects. To date, approximately 25,000 protection plaques have been distributed to 2,360 Austrian communes.

In view of the possible need to transport cultural property to a central refuge providing special protection, work has begun on adapting the Steinbergstollen at Alt Aussee to modern requirements.

To meet the Bundesdenkmalamt's needs, a secure store has been constructed at the Hofburg in Vienna, where the Bundesdenkmalamt's duplicate safety files and documents and the documents relating to the alarm and planning arrangements for the protection of cultural property will be kept.

In accordance with Article 25 on the dissemination of the Hague Convention, more and more exhibitions have been organized to make it known to the general public. It has been possible to enlarge the travelling exhibition on the protection of cultural property in Austria, which has been on show a number of times over many years, so that it now displays the most important aspects of the protection of cultural property. Introductory summaries have been produced and articles written to go with it. These are made available to the public in the form of leaflets, booklets and a series of information sheets, published by the

Bundesdenkmalamt. To awaken the interest of school pupils in this question, an essay competition was organized, the best three essays being awarded prizes.

The press and radio have dealt with the protection of cultural property and the Hague Convention a number of times.

Another way of promoting the protection of cultural property is the film 'In the Event of . . .', which deals with this subject. It is available on request from the Federal Ministry of Defence film department.

Two booklets on the protection of cultural property have been published as part of a Bundesdenkmalamt series (Studies on the Protection and Conservation of Monuments - Protection of our Cultural Heritage). These are H. Wittmann's booklet on 'Air-conditioning in Refuges' and O. Wächter's on 'The Restoration and Conservation of Books, Archive Items and Works of Graphic Art' (3rd revised edition). An English version of the second book is being printed and will be published in the United States. Mention should also be made of various articles on the protection of cultural property which have been published, like the article 'Twenty-fifth Anniversary of the Hague International Convention on the Protection of Cultural Property', by Marian Farka in 'Oeffentliche Sicherheit 44' (1979, No. 10) and 'Marking Cultural Property in the Communes in Accordance with the Provisions of the 1954 Hague Convention', in 'Monatliches Mitteilungsblatt des Vorarlberger Gemeindeverbandes' (1979, No. 2).

Among the leaflets and booklets published between 1979 and 1983 we will mention in particular Nos. 9 ('Definitions, Classified by Subject; Appendix to the Catalogue of Measures to be Taken for the Safeguarding of Movable Cultural Property'), 10 ('Measures for the Safeguarding of Movable Cultural Property') and 12 ('Main Aims and Objectives of the 1954 International Convention on the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict').

Given that the protection of cultural property does not fall exclusively within the jurisdiction of the Federal Ministry of Science and Research and its Bundesdenkmalamt, close co-operation is necessary with all the other Federal Ministries, central, provincial and local government departments and military and civil authorities concerned, and with the owners or administrators of Austria's cultural heritage.

Thus the protection of cultural property becomes, along with other questions, an integral part of national civil defence and hence of overall national defence through the National Civil Defence Action Committee of the Federal Ministry of the Interior. The Austrian Civil Protection Federation, in its instructions to civil servants and teachers, makes the section on 'Protection of Cultural Property in Accordance with the Hague Convention' compulsory, and its associations at provincial level inform the public on all matters relating to national civil defence. In this way it has been possible to reach over three million people.

The plan for the protection of the Federal Provinces against natural disasters also includes

preventive measures to safeguard the nation's cultural heritage.

At the military level (i. e. the jurisdiction of the Federal Ministry of Defence), the protection of cultural property is included in service regulations and instructions and is the subject of appropriate instruction during military training.

Among the service regulations and instructions dealing with the protection of cultural property we will cite Decree No. 30.530/38-5, 9/80, 'Instructions for the Protection of Cultural Property'; the booklet 'Convention on the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict' published by the Ministry of Defence and used as an instruction manual; a standard course for unit commanders on the protection of cultural property; an information sheet on the Convention on the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict; and a booklet on the four Geneva conventions distributed by the Red Cross to all national servicemen. This deals with the protection of cultural property in an appendix.

The officers of the 3rd Bureau attached to the BEGS army corps commanders are responsible for co-operation with the civil authorities and for monitoring the care taken of cultural property.

The army's training programme provides for a course for national servicemen as part of the basic training of all the armed forces; a course for soldiers of all ranks in each unit, as part of 'Instruction concerning defence policy'; courses on 'The protection of cultural property in the event of armed conflict' given in the context of training for non-commissioned officers; and courses as part of officer training at the Military Academy. A three-day training course is organized at the School for NBC (nuclear, biological and chemical) Defence, for army officers and officers of the territorial military divisions and brigades who are responsible for the protection of cultural property.

Exercises regarding the protection of cultural property aim to improve co-operation between the civil and military authorities.

BULGARIA

The Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict is a permanent subject of study in many of the schools and universities in the People's Republic of Bulgaria. The basic provisions of the Convention are included in the overall training programme of the soldiers of the Bulgarian People's Army. Bearing in mind the humanistic character of the Bulgarian People's Army, its functions, aims and tasks, instructions are given for the strict preservation of cultural property to all categories of servicemen at different stages of their qualification. Some categories of servicemen such as pilots and engineers, are made familiar in the smallest detail with the requirements of the Convention and with the distinctive sign for the protection of cultural property. Special bodies

have been established in the cultural institutions for taking measures and carrying out educational initiatives for the protection of cultural property in the event of armed conflict. This ensures permanent collaboration between the military and civil authorities in the country for the preservation of cultural property. The humanistic character of the socialist society creates the necessary realistic conditions and organizes the entire education among the people, which is carried out by the political and social organizations and the mass media to teach them respect for the cultural and historic heritage of all nations.

In recent years, organized measures have been taken for the preservation of the nation's cultural heritage. The celebration of the 1,300th Anniversary of the Bulgarian State helped to introduce many initiatives. A number of practical steps have been accomplished and original actions for Bulgaria have been taken. Conditions have been created in which our entire society helps to solve the complex problems connected with the preservation of cultural monuments. This is the task of the entire society of the country, which guarantees its successful fulfilment in time of peace as well as in wartime.

The body which carries out the official policy and observes the strict application of the legislative provisions is the Committee for Culture. Under its guidance, the system of legal protection and norms is constantly improved and perfected. 'The Law for Cultural Monuments', 'The Law for the State Archives', a number of State regulations and instructions found a practical application and helped to improve the organization of the preservation, conservation, reinforcement and restoration works. Under the 'Regulation concerning the reporting on preservation work undertaken on movable historical property', an organized unit was established in the country to report on the preservation work carried out on movable historic property. This regulation is compulsory for all social, state and cultural institutions. Movable historic monuments are protected by the law and are registered by public organizations. Measures are taken for the registration of collections belonging to private individuals. The Statute concerning the structure and the aims of the National Institute for Cultural Monuments regulates all points concerning the registration, documentation, restoration and conservation of immovable cultural monuments.

Under the methodological guidance of the Committee for Culture, the National 'Cyril and Methodius' Library, the National Art Gallery, the National Historical Museum and the National Institute for Cultural Monuments, the identification, classification and documentation of cultural monuments have been completed. There now exists full documentation, full registration of the items in all museums, libraries and galleries concerned with immovable cultural monuments. Photographic documentation (slides, films, microfilms) is more frequently used.

In the People's Republic of Bulgaria there are 216 State museums and over 480 museum collections. They contain over 3,000,000 movable

cultural items. There are more than 10,000 libraries, with a total of 90,000,000 volumes. 'Bulgarian photography' preserves over 5,000,000 negatives. In the Bulgarian Radio, 420,000 sound records are available from different types of tapes and unique gramophone records. The storage houses of the State archives are rich; 22,000 immovable cultural monuments are registered and 35,000 listed.

In 'The World Heritage List' the following Bulgarian monuments are included: Boyana church, rock-hewn churches of Ivanovo, the Madara Rider, the Thracian tomb of Kanaslak, the Ancient City of Nessebar and Rila Monastery.

Under the methodological guidance of the Committee for Culture, practical measures have been taken for the preservation of cultural monuments in case of armed conflict. Measures are being taken to reduce the historically created concentration of cultural property in the big towns. Side by side with the development of the museum, library and gallery network, there is a trend towards the decentralization of new construction sites. Their concentration in the big towns has to be avoided. This, as a rule, is also observed in the construction of new immovable cultural monuments. Decentralization has also been achieved by transferring 100-150 kms away from the big towns part of the movable cultural objects which are not displayed in exhibitions and by preserving them in special depots. The special programmes of the cultural institutions foresee the construction of special bomb shelters in case of an eventual armed conflict. The evacuation places are now fully prepared for the storage of cultural property.

Many different types of action have been taken for the restoration of immovable cultural monuments. Better conditions have been created for most of the important cultural monuments by strengthening their foundations through silicification. New methods are being used to reinforce already existing architectural units. In this sphere, considerable improvement has been achieved in the work done on the cultural monuments registered in the 'World Heritage List'.

In accordance with the provisions of Article 16 of the Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict, the cultural institutions and organizations have prepared the distinctive sign of the Convention to be used for indicating cultural property, registered under the Convention. Similar action is also being taken by the cultural institutions which are responsible for the most important immovable cultural monuments. The cultural institutions concerned also have to organize the transportation of movable cultural objects in case of armed conflict.

It is well known that the domestic and foreign policy of the People's Republic of Bulgaria is in favour of the prevention of armed conflicts and the preservation of peace among nations. In addition to this, many different activities are organized for the preparation of the population in case of armed conflict. These actions, taken among the armed forces and the civil population, are based on the deep respect of all peoples and of their

intellectual and cultural heritage, materialized through their cultural monuments.

BYELORUSSIAN SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLIC

The Convention on the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict, adopted at The Hague on 14 May 1954, was ratified by the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic in a law passed by the Praesidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Byelorussian SSR on 18 March 1957.

The Soviet State has, since the beginning of its existence, always attached great importance to questions concerning the protection and conservation of the nation's cultural heritage and historic monuments. Brought up in the spirit of Leninism, the Soviet people learn to preserve and care for their historical and cultural heritage. During the Second World War, Soviet soldiers showed heroism and valour in saving from destruction a large number of monuments and works of art which the Nazis sought to destroy.

The saving by Soviet soldiers of the masterpieces in the Dresden Pinakothek is a well-known historical fact.

Since the Soviets came to power in the Byelorussian SSR, great progress has been made in the protection, restoration and use of historic monuments and the nation's cultural heritage.

On 14 April 1978, the ninth extraordinary session of the Supreme Soviet of the Byelorussian SSR of the ninth legislature adopted a new Constitution (basic law of the Byelorussian SSR), Article 27 of which states: 'The State concerns itself with protecting, augmenting and making extensive use of society's cultural wealth for the moral and aesthetic education of the Soviet people, for the raising of their cultural level'.

All means are used in the Byelorussian SSR to encourage professional and amateur artistic activities.

The right of citizens to the benefits of cultural attainments is laid down in Article 44: 'Citizens of the Byelorussian SSR have the right to enjoy cultural benefits'.

This right is guaranteed in various ways: freedom of access to national and world cultural property in the collections held by the State and social organizations; the development and even distribution throughout the country of cultural and educational establishments; the development of television and radio, publishing, the periodical press and free libraries; the extension of cultural exchanges with foreign States.

Article 66 of the Constitution states: 'Concern for the preservation of historical monuments and other cultural values is a duty and obligation of citizens of the Byelorussian SSR'.

On 14 July 1978, the Supreme Soviet of the Byelorussian SSR passed a law on the preservation and use of the nation's cultural and historical heritage.

This law states, *inter alia*, that the historical and cultural heritage of the peoples of the USSR

illustrates the material and spiritual life of past generations, the country's long history and the struggle of the masses for its freedom and independence, the revolutionary movement and the establishment and development of the Soviet Socialist State.

Historic monuments and other cultural property are tangible reminders of very important events of the great socialist October Revolution, the civil war and the Second World War, the exploits of the working class, kolkhoz farm workers and the intelligentsia, of the fraternal friendship of the peoples of our country and the heroic struggle of the Soviet people to build socialism and communism.

The historical and cultural heritage of the peoples of the USSR is an integral part of the world's cultural heritage and an attestation of the great contribution the peoples of our country have made to the development of world civilization.

In our country, historic monuments are used in developing science, education and culture and in inculcating in the workers a noble feeling of patriotism and the principles of morality, internationalism and aesthetics.

The protection of monuments is an important function of State bodies and social organizations.

The law sets out the objectives of Soviet legislation on the protection and use of the nation's cultural and historical heritage, defines the notion of heritage, and also defines the powers of the local soviets of people's deputies and their executive committees as regards the protection and use of historic monuments and cultural property. It also contains articles on the participation of social organizations and citizens in implementing measures for the protection and use of their historic and cultural heritage. Article 13 states that the voluntary association for the safeguarding of the historical and cultural heritage of the Byelorussian SSR should encourage considerable sections of the population to participate actively and directly in discovering and protecting monuments; that it should bring monuments and the legislation governing their protection to the knowledge of very large numbers of people; and that it should take an active part in the work of the official bodies for the protection of monuments, and should supervise the patronage of monuments by enterprises.

Section II of the law covers questions affecting the official inventory of cultural and historic property, Section III questions concerning its conservation and ways of using it. Section IV contains articles on penalties for breaches of the law on the protection and use of our historical and cultural heritage.

Section V states that should an international agreement or treaty to which the USSR or the Byelorussian SSR are party lay down regulations other than those contained in the legislation of the USSR or the Byelorussian SSR on the protection and use of historical and cultural property, the regulations of the international agreement or treaty shall prevail. These are the basic provisions of the Republic's legislation on the protection and defence of cultural property.

It should be noted that over the past few years, the Association for the Safeguarding of the Heritage of the USSR and Byelorussia, which counts archaeologists, historians, architects and artists among its members, has done much to aid in the discovery, restoration and protection of such monuments. The Association plans its activities in close collaboration with the official bodies responsible for the protection of monuments, the bodies in charge of restoration work, the national education authorities, the press, cinema and television, and cultural societies. The Association has contributed much to instilling in the public a respect for their cultural heritage.

Major research into the country's cultural heritage has been undertaken in the Republic. The Institute of History of the Art, Ethnography and Folklore of the Byelorussian SSR Academy of Sciences is preparing for publication a seven-volume work entitled 'Directory of the Historical Monuments and Cultural Property of the Byelorussian SSR', in which an exhaustive description will be given of the main historic monuments and items of cultural property to be found in the Republic.

As regards the measures to be taken for the protection of cultural property in the event of armed conflict, it should be remembered that the major objective of the Soviet Government's foreign policy is to maintain peace. As is said in the political declaration of the Warsaw Pact Member States of 5 January 1983, 'To count on victory after unleashing a nuclear war is an absurd calculation. If a nuclear war is unleashed, there will be no victors. The war will inevitably lead to the annihilation of entire nations, vast destruction and catastrophic consequences for civilization and life on earth'.

In its capacity as a member of the United Nations, Unesco and other international organizations, the Byelorussian SSR invariably declares itself in favour of eliminating the threat of nuclear war and limiting the arms race. There can be no more important task at the present time than that of stopping the warmongers. This is what is required in the interests of all nations, in particular for the safeguarding of our historical and cultural heritage.

The Secretary-General of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Yuri V. Andropov, in a speech made in Moscow on 4 May 1983, said: 'At this moment, when the threat of nuclear catastrophe weighs on the whole of humanity, the duty of all those who are responsible for taking political decisions is, above all, to watch over the keeping of the peace'.

This is why the Soviet Union's unilateral commitment not to be the first to use nuclear weapons has aroused hope and approval throughout the world.

'If our example is followed by other nuclear powers', the Secretary-General of the Communist Party of the USSR, Yuri V. Andropov, said in his report 'The sixty years' existence of the USSR', 'it will contribute in a truly decisive way to averting the threat of nuclear war'.

The workers of the Byelorussian SSR ardently support the Soviet State's peaceful policy which aims to avert all danger of nuclear war, a war which is synonymous with the death of human civilization and the destruction of all historical and cultural monuments.

CYPRUS

The Department of Antiquities, which is responsible for the preservation of cultural property in collaboration with several private organizations (such as the Association of Civil Engineers and Architects, the Pancyprian Organization of Architectural Heritage) and Government Departments, has disseminated the text of the Convention to the civilian population. The Cyprus Broadcasting Corporation has given full support to this effort. On the other hand, contacts have been made with the military commander of the Island. A list of monuments and sites has been handed over to him, and the Convention has been discussed and explained to the officers of the Army.

Since 1975, the emblem of the Convention has been put on the roofs and in front of museums and important monuments and sites in the area under the control of the government. Unfortunately, in the area occupied by the Turkish army, museums and monuments have been pillaged or destroyed. The government has repeatedly applied to Unesco and asked the mission of observers to report on the condition of the monuments. So far this mission has met with the refusal of the Turkish 'authorities'.

The area of Paphos, which suffered from the Turkish bombardment of 1974, was included in the World Heritage List of Unesco in 1980.

For the execution of the Convention, the Director of the Department of Antiquities, Dr Vassos Karageorghis, has been designated as qualified to fulfil the functions of General Commissioner for Cultural Property.

FRANCE

1981 REPORT

Having consulted the departments concerned at the Ministry of Culture, I have the following observations to make:

Museums

In ratifying the Hague Convention, the States concerned committed themselves to making preparations, in peacetime, for the safeguarding of the cultural property on their own territory against the foreseeable effects of armed conflict.

The French Museums Council has taken these preparations quite a long way. It has set up a special department, headed by a Curator, for the protection of the collections in national, classified and registered museums;

it has requested and obtained the allocation of works or buildings for use as refuges for these collections;

it has had museum objects classified into categories so that protection can be organized according to each object's importance;

it has appointed a delegate for each of the country's defence zones; these delegates, with the help of their deputies, are responsible for the application of the protection measures;

it has requested the National Heritage Council to provide for the repair and maintenance of the works and buildings to be used as refuges;

it has used its own funds to convert the blockhouse at Saint-Germain-en-Laye into the main refuge for the Paris region;

it has informed the Director of General Administration of its wish that special funds should be requested from the General Defence Secretariat so that conversion work can be extended to all refuges.

The arrangements which have been in force since 1955 are shortly to be revised and brought into line with the new organization of the Ministry.

Archives

The Espeyran Central Depot contributes in this respect to the safeguarding of the nation's heritage in the event of armed conflict.

Current standards for temperature and humidity and for the quality of reproduction are applied at this depot, situated at Saint-Gilles-du-Gard. It is thus able to afford the best protection possible, in theory for an unlimited period, for microfilms of original archives. The most important archives are continuing to be systematically microfilmed as a measure against possible destruction, particularly in the event of war.

A further advantage, should armed conflict occur, is the depot's location in the countryside and its distance from Paris and from most of the administrative regions which send it their microfilm originals.

The depot has not, however, been designed to withstand atomic war. The estimate of the costs involved in applying the strict specifications laid down for nuclear protection (installation of accommodation, special anti-radiation shields, etc.) was so enormous that the building of such a depot could never have been undertaken. Furthermore, all the indications are that a shelter of this kind would, in the event of a nuclear alert, be invaded by large numbers of people seeking to save their lives to the detriment of the microfilms - occupying the premises and disrupting the constant +13° air conditioning, so rendering such installations ineffective.

The originals of all National Archives microfilms (Archives series and outside documents) are stored at Espeyran, where the laboratories make a second copy of each (an 'internegative') for further duplications, so as to provide additional protection for the original films.

As at 1 January 1980, approximately 600,000 metres of film had been deposited by the National Archives photographic department, reproducing

approximately 12 million historical documents.

The Overseas Territories Department has also sent copies of all the microfilms of the old colonial registers of births, deaths and marriages and all their extra microfilms to Espeyran - about 50,000 metres of microfilm corresponding to 1 million documents.

The archives in the Administrative Departments (Indre et Loire, Côte d'Or, Val de Marne, Essone, etc.) send a copy of each of their microfilms, often the only copy, to be duplicated at Espeyran, especially in the case of old registers of births, deaths and marriages. Departmental archive material received at Espeyran can at present be estimated at approximately 100,000 metres of film, or 2 million documents.

The National Weather Centre has also entrusted to the Espeyran depot, on a reclaimable basis, the microfilm of its technical archives going back to 1945 - roughly 90,000 metres of microfilm, or nearly 2 million documents and diagrams.

The Nuclear Physics Laboratory at Gif-sur-Yvette has the films of its experiments, in a special format and with an estimated 1 million frames, stored at Espeyran.

If other material in store is added, such as film deposited by the Ministry of Justice (microfilms which have been used to reconstruct the registers of births, deaths and marriages for disaster areas, etc.), the total as at 1 January 1980 comes to 1,218,000 metres of original microfilm in store in the central depot, independently of the copies made as a parallel security collection.

Thus the Espeyran depot is already contributing to the conservation on microfilm of over 24 million historical and scientific documents.

Its total design capacity is 12 million metres of microfilm, reproducing a minimum of 100 million historical and scientific documents or, more probably, about 200 million if it is remembered that the only microfilms of which a copy is made and kept in the same premises as the original are those from which it is intended to make further copies.

National heritage

Although not directly connected with the implementation of the Hague Convention of 14 May 1954, ratified by France in 1957, the National Heritage Council has taken measures which could, if necessary, provide a degree of protection for cultural property in the event of armed conflict.

(1) The General Inventory of France's monuments and objects of artistic value is not officially intended for the protection of the items it lists or describes, either in war or any other circumstances, but aims to preserve the memory of all material cultural property which is expected to disappear or deteriorate.

In the event of the buildings and movable objects described by the Inventory being destroyed, the documents about them would make it possible to keep an exact record and even to restore or reconstruct them.

(2) The fact that this documentation consists of several different materials (ordinary filing systems,

microfiches, photogrammetric plates, computer files, printed publications) and the fact that they are kept in a number of different, scattered places, makes their wholesale destruction unlikely. It should be noted that, in this respect, the computer file remains the most susceptible medium as it is kept in one place and is highly sensitive to nuclear radiation. For this reason in particular it is vital to continue to use ordinary filing systems and microfiches. Microfiches are still the least costly and most easily handled means of duplicating a mass of information, especially when both text and images are involved.

(3) During 1982, the Photographic Conservation Centre was set up at the Fort de Saint-Cyr, providing the best conditions of temperature and humidity for the conservation of the collections of photographs assembled there. This has led the National Photographic Heritage Mission to consider the question of special protection in the event of armed conflict (2 million old photographic plates safeguarded initially). Its location in one of the military forts round Paris would protect the collection from the damage caused by conventional warfare.

(4) The Subsidiary Council on Archaeology is drawing up a list of sites in France where there are important archaeological remains but not in strategic localities. A similar list of historic monuments and sites could be drawn up, mentioning in particular the areas already on the World Heritage List.

In the event of armed conflict on French soil, the military authorities could be requested to declare the sites on these lists open towns, and the lists would be distributed to all Contracting States of the Convention who were in armed conflict with our country, either on their initiative or our own.

(5) Some sites in strategic towns could be placed under special protection and entered in the Register held by Unesco's Director-General as provided for in Article 8 of the Convention, but the scale of the sites and cultural property that could receive this protection remains to be specified.

Conclusion

It would certainly be desirable for France to be one of those States which have fulfilled the obligations to which they have subscribed. In this respect it should be noted that France has not asked for any of its refuges for the protection of cultural property in the event of armed conflict, historic monuments or other cultural property of great importance covered by Article 8 of the Convention, to be entered in the International Register of Cultural Property under Special Protection. This is, however, an essential condition for the protection of cultural property in the event of armed conflict, although only Austria, the Netherlands, the Vatican and more recently Germany have to date fulfilled this obligation.

1983 REPORT

This document adds to and updates the report dated 20 July 1981 already transmitted to Unesco.

I. National, classified and registered museums

Special department set up for the protection of collections in national, classified and registered museums, headed by a Curator; a delegate appointed for each of the country's defence zones, to be responsible for the implementation of protection measures; buildings allotted for use as refuges for these collections and conversion of the blockhouse at St. Germain-en-Laye to serve as the main refuge for the Paris region; museum objects classified into several categories so that protective measures can be applied according to the importance of each object.

II. National Archives

The programme continues for reproducing original archive material on microfilm and storing two copies of each of these microfilms in the Espeyran Centre at Saint-Gilles-du-Gard.

This project currently covers 12 million historical documents held by the National Archives. Other archives are also using this facility (the old colonial register of births, deaths and marriages; some archive material deposited by the administrative Departments, the Ministry of Justice, the National Weather Centre, the nuclear physics laboratory at Gif-sur-Yvette).

III. National Library

A similar programme of document reproduction on microfilm, which began in 1943, is continuing. The microfilms are stored in Provins and Sablé, where storage capacity is soon to be extended.

In addition, a new centre is to be opened at Saint-Lizier in the next few years.

IV. Georges Pompidou National Centre of Art and Culture

A protection plan for the Museum of Modern Art is currently being drawn up.

V. National heritage of monuments and movable objects

Work on the General Inventory of France's monuments and objects of artistic value continues. This project will make it possible to have records of all material cultural property which is expected to disappear or deteriorate.

This documentation consists of several different materials (ordinary filing systems, microfiches, photogrammetric plates, computer files, printed publications) and is stored in a number of different places, making their wholesale destruction unlikely. In many cases they would make it possible to restore or even reconstruct the listed buildings.

VI. Photographs

A photograph conservation centre was recently opened at the Fort du Saint-Cyr.

VII. Films

Films are being stored in the Bois d'Arcy Centre which has been specially set aside for this purpose.

Finally, we would point out that the implementation of the Convention's provisions regarding (a) entering of refugees for the protection of cultural property in the event of armed conflict, of monuments, and of cultural property of great importance in the International Register of Cultural Property under Special Protection, and (b) the distinctive marking of cultural property are currently under consideration from a technical point of view. However, we cannot for the present make any statement on the conclusions that the relevant departments might put forward.

GERMAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC

The wording of the Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict, the regulations for its execution and the protocol as well as the information on the accession of the German Democratic Republic on 16 January 1974 have been published in the law gazette (special issue No. 782) for the information of the population of the German Democratic Republic.

In the following period, a number of further basic legal regulations have been adopted by the Government of the German Democratic Republic which provide for the protection of cultural property and pay heed to basic regulations of the Hague Convention on the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict.

The People's Chamber of the German Democratic Republic enacted the 'Law on the Preservation of Monuments in the GDR' on 19 June 1975. Monuments have been classified and are being marked in a uniform manner, with the single distinctive emblem of the Convention being used as well.

A 'Decree on the National Museum Fund of the German Democratic Republic' and the regulations for its execution primarily laid down uniform State regulations regarding the recording and classification of movable cultural property in accordance with the above-mentioned Convention.

The People's Chamber of the German Democratic Republic adopted the 'Law on the Protection of Cultural Property of the German Democratic Republic' on 3 July 1980. This law settles the responsibility of State bodies, owners, proprietors and all the other people authorized to dispose of cultural property and their duties regarding the prevention and removal of dangers to cultural property.

The German Democratic Republic Council of Ministers, on the basis of the experience-gathered and results achieved so far in implementing the Convention, issued regulations which concentrate on uniform rules and principles for an all-round preparation of protective

measures for cultural property in accordance with the Hague Convention, applicable to all State and social sectors.

The laws and the other legal regulations for the protection of cultural property have been published or are currently recommended by certain means and methods to the population, particularly managers and staff of State bodies and all those authorized to dispose of cultural property.

Newspapers and magazines, specialist literature and other information materials, courses and lectures at educational institutions of the State bodies and at technical schools and colleges systematically comment on problems of the Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict and its implementation in the German Democratic Republic.

The following measures are being taken to safeguard cultural property:

Planning, organization and carrying out of measures for the protection of cultural property by State bodies in counties, districts and towns and by those authorized to dispose of cultural property, with due regard being paid to the immediate importance attached to internationally and nationally valuable cultural property; enlarging or establishing depositories for the safe storage of movable cultural property; preparing measures for the structural protection of selected monuments which are of importance for the international and national cultural heritage; producing microfilms of selected documents and scientific evidence of cultural property; training staff for the protection of cultural property, and preparing the marking of cultural property in accordance with the Convention.

In the interest of a uniform and effective preparation of the protective measures, instructional methodological guidelines have been laid down for State bodies and those authorized to dispose of cultural property, which have proved efficient and feasible and are now the obligatory State rules and principles for the protection of cultural property in the German Democratic Republic.

Those guidelines comprise primarily the following spheres:

Planning of protective measures by State bodies and institutions disposing of cultural property, including measures for topographical registration and recording; measures for the protection of monuments, mainly by means of safeguarding documents on the most important monuments and preparation of their structural protection; providing safety for buildings housing movable cultural property.

There are nation-wide regulations for marking cultural property in accordance with Articles 6 and 17 of the Convention.

The great importance being attached to cultural property and its protection also finds expression in the German Democratic Republic's Law on National Defence. Measures are carried out within the framework of civil defence. On the basis of teaching programmes and materials,

special staff for the protection of cultural property in museums and institutions are given systematic training which is aimed at supplementing their theoretical knowledge of the protection of cultural property and improving their ability to deal with the practical planning, organization and carrying out of protective measures for movable and immovable cultural property.

Newspapers and other publications deal with problems of the protection of cultural property and explain the content of the Convention.

FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

1. Ratification and entry into force

The Federal Republic of Germany approved the Convention of 14 May 1954 for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict and the Protocol to the Convention by means of the Law of 11 April 1967 concerning the Convention, published in the Federal Law Gazette 1967, part II, page 1233, as amended by the Law of 10 August 1971, published in the Federal Law Gazette 1971, part II, page 1025. In accordance with Article 33(2), the Convention and the Protocol entered into force for the Federal Republic of Germany on 11 November 1967, the instrument of ratification having been deposited with the Director-General of Unesco on 11 August 1967.

Pursuant to the first sentence of Article 2(1) of the Law, the Federal Laender implement the Convention on behalf of the Federal Government, unless the Law provides otherwise.

2. The Federal Republic of Germany considers the following measures appropriate for the protection of cultural property in accordance with Article 3 of the Convention:

2.1 Dissemination of the Convention

2.1.1 In the civilian sector

In conformity with Article 25 of the Convention, the Federal Civil Defence Office published in 1966 a German translation of the text of the Convention, of the Regulations for its execution, and of the Protocol, of which a third revised edition (175,000 copies) appeared in 1979. The Federal Civil Defence Office is thus fulfilling the task of disseminating the Convention, as is required of it by the Law. The brochure is distributed to Federal, Land and local authorities, to schools, universities, museums, art galleries, churches, press organs and, on request, to others.

2.1.2 In the armed forces sector

The obligation to disseminate the text of the Convention among the armed forces was met by

printing in full the Convention, the Regulations for its execution, and the Protocol under the Central Service Regulations of the Federal Ministry of Defence on 16 July 1959 under the title 'International law of war - collection of agreements and conventions', which has been kept up to date by means of replacements and supplements. The requirements of Articles 7 and 25 of the Convention have thus been met.

2.2 Microfilming of valuable archives for safeguarding

The Federal Republic has been microfilming valuable archives since 1961. Until now approximately 350 million microcopies have been made. The rolls of film are placed in steel containers and stored under suitable climatic conditions in the Central Refuge, the Oberried mine drift near Freiburg. The mine drift was entered in the International Register of Cultural Property under Special Protection on 22 April 1978.

The staff engaged in this microfilming are financed from the federal budget. A total of forty-six persons are involved; approximately DM 19.4 million was spent on their remuneration from 1973 to 1983. During the same period about DM 3.8 million of federal funds was spent on equipment (cameras, development apparatus, readers, etc.). At present, the Federal Ministry of the Interior is endeavouring, in consultation with the Laender, to extend the microfilming concept applied so far to include an increasing number of non-governmental archives, i.e. those of the churches, of noble families and private collections. Archives are selected for protection on the basis of a directive issued in August 1980 by the Federal Civil Defence Office on the microfilming of archives for the purpose of safeguarding, which the Laender comply with.

2.3 Identification of immovable cultural property in the Federal Republic of Germany

2.3.1 The following progress has been made in identifying immovable cultural property with the single distinctive emblem pursuant to Article 17(2)(a) of the Convention:

The Federal and Land authorities have agreed to draw up lists of items deemed worthy of protection which are to be identified with the single distinctive emblem. These lists, which are based on Land legislation on the protection of monuments, will be available by the end of 1983. The military authorities are also participating in this selection procedure.

Initially it is intended to identify 8,000 architectural monuments in accordance with the following distributive formula agreed on by the Federal and Land authorities:

Land	Distributive formula	Buildings, including groups of buildings
Baden-Wuerttemberg	17	1, 360
Bavaria	20	1, 600
Berlin	4	320
Bremen	1	80
Hamburg	3	240
Hesse	10	800
Lower Saxony	12	960
North-Rhine Westphalia	16	1, 280
Rhineland-Palatinate	10	800
Saarland	2	160
Schleswig-Holstein	5	400
	100	8, 000

2. 3. 2 In addition to the measures described in section 2. 3. 1 above, the Federal Republic is endeavouring to identify further items to be granted special protection pursuant to Article 8 of the Convention.

2. 4 Provision of refuges for sheltering movable cultural property

In the period under review, i. e. 1977 to 1982, the Federal Government financed two refuges for sheltering the following movable cultural property:

the Aachen Cathedral treasure;
the Offenbach Leatherware and Shoe Museum.

The two refuges are pilot projects because of the structural innovations needed, above all with regard to theft protection, air-conditioning and fire-proofing.

In addition, studies are being made to ascertain, for instance, whether mines that have been closed down can be converted into refuges.

3. Other measures envisaged

The following additional measures are envisaged:

3. 1 Training of personnel for the protection of cultural property, in accordance with Articles 15 and 25 of the Convention,

3. 2 Foundation of a registered private association at the federal level to promote the idea of the protection of cultural property by, inter alia, assuming organizational functions. This will ensure that the idea of the protection of cultural property is given effect on a wider scale.

In this context, mention should be made of the international symposium on the protection of cultural property which was held by the Hanns Seidel Foundation in Cologne in November 1981 at the proposal of the Federal Government. On that occasion it was suggested considering the possibility of founding a European federation made up

of the national associations responsible for the protection of cultural property.

3. 3 Photogrammetric recording of architectural monuments deemed worthy of protection.

3. 4 Provision of materials for the protection of movable and immovable cultural property.

4. Commissioners-General for Cultural Property

Professor Karl Döhring and Professor Karl Josef Partsch, who were nominated as Commissioners-General for Cultural Property by the Federal Government in conformity with Article 1 of the Regulations for the Execution of the Convention, were reaffirmed in their functions by the Federal Foreign Office with effect from 1 July 1981.

HOLY SEE

Given that the Hague Convention covers the whole of the Vatican City, the State Chancery does not consider it necessary to draw up a list identifying each item of cultural property.

For a reply to the other questions, reference may be made to Communication No. 4416/77 of 14 June 1977:

measures recently adopted by the General Directorate of Pontifical Museums and Galleries (training of custodial staff, establishment of an internal radio communications system, television surveillance, installation of electronic security systems) with the aim of preventing and halting acts of theft, pillage and destruction of cultural property as much as acts of vandalism; provisions for the safeguarding of St Peter's Basilica and the works of art it contains; measures for the protection of Michelangelo's Pietà; day and night surveillance by appropriate means in order to prevent, as far as is possible, thefts and damage.

ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN

Ever since the establishment of the Islamic Republic of Iran, the Islamic Consultative Assembly and the Government have made serious efforts to safeguard the cultural heritage in application of the provisions of the Hague Convention. These efforts have included the search for identification and unearthing of historical remains and their preservation and presentation to the public within the framework of existing cultural facilities.

Examples of the measures taken to this end are given below.

Application of the Geneva and the Hague provisions concerning respect by the armed forces of international regulations in the event of armed conflict

(1) Selected provisions from the Geneva Convention and Regulations were inserted into

Articles 71 and 72 of disciplinary note No. M-16-2 for the month of Shahriyar 1360 circulated to the armed forces of the Islamic Republic of Iran. These articles are the subject of instruction to all members of the armed forces, including the rank and file (see below).

(2) Brochures containing the four Geneva Conventions have been distributed to combatants so that they will be familiar with their provisions.

(3) Selected wartime regulations, including the Convention on the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict, have been mimeographed on cards and distributed to all soldiers with a view to the observation of these regulations in time of war.

(4) Instruction is given on the provisions of the Geneva and Hague Conventions and other international wartime regulations to higher-ranking staff officers and members of the Staff Academy, who pass on the instruction to their subordinates.

Selected wartime laws and regulations (enacted in compliance with the Geneva Convention)

Article 68. The provisions of the Geneva Convention shall apply to members of the armed forces and regular volunteers who fulfil the following conditions:

(a) that of being commanded by a person responsible for his subordinates;

(b) that of having a distinctive sign;

(c) that of carrying arms openly;

(d) that of conducting their operations in accordance with the laws and customs of war.

Article 69. Prisoners of war and wounded persons shall be treated humanely. Prisoners of war shall not be exposed in combat zones. They shall not be compelled to do work of a dangerous nature.

Article 70. Sick, wounded and shipwrecked persons shall be given medical treatment and proper care.

Article 71. Hospitals, places used for assembling military or civilian wounded, religious, scientific and artistic buildings that are used for welfare activities and vehicles that bear distinctive markings for the transport of the sick and wounded (provided that they are not exploited for military purposes) shall not be made targets of attack.

No corporal punishment shall be inflicted upon wounded and shipwrecked enemy prisoners; they shall not be murdered and they shall not be compelled to participate in military operations against their own countries.

It is prohibited to fire on the passengers or crew of military or civilian enemy aircraft who are parachuting to safety, with the exception of persons participating in airborne operations.

Commercial ships and aircraft belonging to neutral countries shall not be seized or destroyed unless they are engaged in acts of contraband, are forcing a maritime blockade or are engaged in actions in violation of the laws of neutrality.

Article 72. Military personnel shall not:

(a) fire on, kill or wound an enemy who has

laid down his arms or been taken prisoner or with whom a ceasefire agreement has been concluded;

(b) appropriate objects of a personal or sentimental nature found on prisoners and on the dead or wounded;

(c) refuse to take alive an enemy who has surrendered unconditionally;

(d) engage in acts of looting and vandalism; unless specifically ordered to do so;

(e) subject prisoners to cruel treatment or torture in order to extract information from them, other than their name, rank, date of birth and serial number;

(f) take hostages or engage in acts of reprisal or of individual or collective punishment;

(g) carry out sentences without previous judgement pronounced by a regularly constituted court, except for breaches of discipline;

(h) assault, mistreat or imprison an enemy envoy coming to negotiate and carrying a white flag;

(i) use under false pretences a white flag, a national emblem or any emblem of an international organization;

(j) punish civilian populations for offences for which they are not responsible.

Measures taken by the Council of the Revolution and the Islamic Consultative Assembly to protect historic remains

The Council of the Revolution of the Islamic Republic of Iran, acting on proposal No. 64434 of 10 December 1979 of the Ministry of Economy and Finance, approved the following provisions at its 12 January 1979 session:

(1) the export of antiques or artistic objects of all kinds is prohibited;

(2) the export of gold and silver in any form and in any quantity, as well as objects manufactured from them, with the exception of common items of jewellery which may be a traveller's personal effects, is prohibited.

Measures taken for the protection of cultural property during the war thrust upon Iran

'The High Contracting Parties undertake to respect cultural property situated within their own territory as well as within the territory of other High Contracting Parties' (extract from Article 4 of the Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict).

Even though it is a Contracting Party to this Convention, Iraq has in the course of its invasion of Iran, in defiance of all international covenants and regulations, caused irreparable damage to valuable historic buildings, destroying several museums and priceless cultural remains in western and southern Iran.

The need to safeguard museum objects and archaeological remains has been a constant concern of the officials of the relevant services ever since the beginning of hostilities. To that end, a mission consisting of experts from the Bureau of Historic Remains (formerly the General Bureau

for the Protection of Historic Remains) took the initiative of proceeding to the combat areas in order to inspect archaeological and historical sites and museums and to find ways of providing immediate protection for those cultural works and remains which could be saved from destruction.

I. Abadan

The museum of Abadan was the first target to be hit by Iraqi air raids, its building sustaining the heaviest damage. Because of the exceptional circumstances which prevailed during the first few months of the war, and especially because of the interruption of communications with Khorramshahr, it was not possible to reach Abadan and inspect its museum.

The enemy advance to the vicinity of the city of Shush (Susa) brought the tomb of the Prophet Daniel, the Castle, the museum and its storage areas and the entire archaeological zone within range of enemy fire.

The Castle, which is built on a hill, was hit daily by constant artillery fire, which caused considerable damage and extended also to the museum and its storage areas, which are located very close to the Castle.

The members of the mission were eyewitnesses of the shelling of these buildings on more than one occasion. For example they saw the roof of Storehouse No. 2 collapse after it was hit four times by canon shot; priceless classified historic objects unearthed from the excavations, which represented valuable signposts to the cultural heritage of mankind, were thus destroyed.

The members of the mission photographed some of these scenes of barbaric destruction in order to preserve irrefutable evidence of the violation by Iraq of all international laws and regulations.

The mission gave priority to saving the contents of the museum and to sheltering from enemy fire those objects that had escaped destruction.

The archaeological relics and objects kept at the Shush Museum are stored in the following places:

1. the Museum itself;
2. the Museum's storage area;
3. Storehouse No. 2;
4. underground storage area of Shush Castle.

Generally speaking, the museum's exhibits and those in its storage areas are divided into three categories in accordance with their transportability:

(a) small portable items displayed in showcases or kept in store;

(b) restored bulky items which cannot be moved safely without the use of equipment which the mission did not have; the removal of these items was further obstructed by the continuous shelling of enemy artillery;

(c) heavy items which cannot be transported without the help of cranes and rails.

The following measures were taken under enemy fire:

1. Items in category (a) were inventories,

packed and marked with a general description; they were then transported to Haft-Tapeh in several trips, where they were re-examined and sent on to Tehran.

2. Items in category (b) were reassembled in different parts of the museum, particularly in the corners of rooms, and restored bulky objects were carefully packed and sheltered behind protective barriers; a carved tablet was buried in the sand.

3. Since nothing could be done about them, items in category (c) were left where they were.

II. Haft-Tapeh

Situated 12 km to the south-east of Shush, Haft-Tapeh is even more exposed to air attack. Fortunately, however, the enemy was driven away from the Shush front before any serious damage could occur.

Items in the showcases of the museum gallery were however assembled in seven crates and transferred to Tehran. Heavy bulky objects were sheltered behind protective barriers.

III. Khorramabad

Though Khorramabad was not in a war zone, the museum of Khorramabad, with its precious bronze collections, was within range of air attack.

Its contents were therefore packed in crates and transferred to Tehran by the mission.

Items in the Shush and Haft Tapeh museums were assembled in forty separate cartons and boxes, and were taken in a sealed vehicle to Tehran; the bronze exhibits of the Khorramabad Museum, which were transported by the mission in five crates, are being kept in the storage areas of the Iran-e-Bostan Museum.

As soon as the enemy forces were driven out, repair and reconstruction measures were taken in the liberated war zones, including work on the carpet museum and other museums. Measures were also taken to return exhibits to their original places.

IV. Removal of objects and sculpted plaster casts from Sar-e-Pol-e-Zahob

Excavations at the Yazdeguerd Castle at Sar-e-Pol-e-Zahob unearthed architectural remains dating from the Parthian and Sasanian periods. Because of their size and the materials used, these remains are of great importance, particularly from the military point of view.

The Castle is surrounded by very thick walls surmounted by watch-posts.

There are rooms in the Castle which are full of stonework inspired by Greek art.

After the occupation and bombing of the cities of western Iran, the Archaeological Centre of Iran was made responsible for removing the plaster casts to Tehran. This operation was carried out in eleven days despite continuous enemy shelling. In all, 958 sculpted plaster casts and 55 items of different kinds were carefully packed and transferred to Tehran.

V. Repair of museum exhibits at the Archaeological Centre

The laboratory of the Archaeological Centre of Iran has been made responsible for repairing and safeguarding priceless objects unearthed during archaeological excavations, also the items kept at the Iran-e-Bostan Museum. This laboratory co-operates with other museums.

Below is a brief account of the work carried out by the laboratory:

A bronze statue dating from the Seleucid period, which was in an advanced state of decay, has been repaired.

A second millennium B. C. amphora from the Iran-e-Bostan Museum, previously in pieces, gummed together with sticky paper, has been restored at the laboratory.

An oil painting (404 x 196 cm) dating from the Qajar Dynasty, kept at the Army Museum, has been repaired. The backing of the painting had deteriorated and was torn in several places. The canvas was lined, the backing, which was covered with a black film, was cleaned, the tears were repaired and the colours were restored and brightened.

JORDAN

The Jordanian Government has recently succeeded in obtaining the addition of the Old City of Jerusalem and its walls to the World Heritage List and has submitted applications for the addition to that List of the remaining historical sites of Jordan, particularly Jerash and Petra. The Department is in the process of posting special identification plaques as per the model suggested by Unesco, at all historic sites and buildings and museums.

KUWAIT

It pleases us to state that no armed conflict has occurred in Kuwait since Kuwait ratified the Convention.

With regard to immovable cultural property such as the gates of the Old Kuwaiti Wall, the Red Palace at Al-Jahra and other archaeological sites on Faylakah Island, the Department of Archaeology has assigned permanent guards to such sites.

As regards measures to be taken for the protection of cultural property, we have to state that in accordance with the Kuwaiti Archaeology Law, following the issuance of Amiri Decree No. 11 in 1960 and as defined in Article 16 of the said law, it is stipulated that the Department of Archaeology and Museums, together with the Security Authority, have to take every possible measure to safeguard ancient monuments, historical buildings and other cultural property as foreseen in the International Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict.

With regard to the implementation of the protocol dealing with the import and export of cultural

property, the Kuwaiti Law has dealt with this issue in Section 5, Articles 35 to 41. The law states that the Department of Archaeology and Museums has the authority to control the import and export of such items, in order to prevent their loss from the Kuwaiti territory.

Traders in antiques should obtain a special licence for their trade. All antiquities traded in should be registered and have a sales permit.

The Department of Archaeology has the right to sanction or refuse a licence to export antiquities, and also has authority to issue instructions to customs and port officials to confiscate any antiquities not licensed to be exported. This Kuwaiti law of archaeology is in conformity with all similar laws enforced in other Arab States. It is also in accordance with the proposed law of archaeology, adopted by the Third Arab Conference on Archaeology, which took place in Fez, Morocco, from 8 to 18 November 1956. It is also in agreement with the provisions of the Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict, which was adopted in The Hague on 14 May 1954.

The Kuwaiti Archaeology Law stipulates that the Security Authority has to lend assistance to the Department of Archaeology and Museums and help in safeguarding the archaeological sites and monuments in the event of armed conflict as well as in peacetime, in compliance with the text of the said International Convention.

The following are places of historical importance in Kuwait:

1. The gates of the Old Kuwaiti Wall which were built in 1920.
2. The Red Palace in Al-Jahra which was built at the beginning of the present century.
3. Immovable ancient items on Faylakah Island which include the prehistoric ruins of a temple that goes back to the ancient Greek age (Hellenic era) and the Bronze age.
4. Movable ancient monuments which go back to the Bronze and Greek (Hellenic) age in addition to traditional folklore items.

LIECHTENSTEIN

The text of the Convention has been published in the official compendium of the laws and treaties of Liechtenstein.

There is no military service in Liechtenstein.

The Liechtenstein Commission for the Protection of Cultural Property has decided to mark cultural property with protection signs. Cultural property of particular importance (e. g. the Château de Vaduz, the National Museum) will have the distinctive emblem of the Convention marked on them.

The inventory of Liechtenstein's cultural property has been drawn up.

It is intended to build special premises for the protection of movable cultural property. There are already protective rooms in the National Museum and the Château de Vaduz.

No decision has yet been taken on the question of whether parts of some communes should be formally declared regions of cultural protection.

There is no particular reason for not yet having requested registration of immovable cultural property in the International Register of Cultural Property under Special Protection. This question is still under discussion by the appropriate bodies.

As regards the import and export of cultural property (application of the Protocol) we would like to state that, owing to a customs treaty between Liechtenstein and Switzerland, this matter falls within the jurisdiction of the Swiss authorities.

LUXEMBOURG

No new measures have been taken in the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg in accordance with Article 26 of the Convention on the Protection of Cultural Property. However, work on drawing up detailed inventories of the cultural institutes has been accelerated. Efforts have also been made to install this property in places which in any case provide excellent protection in peacetime. Efforts have been made to inform the military authorities of the importance of the Convention.

MEXICO

The University of the Army and Air Force has taken the text of the Convention and its Regulations into account in the curricula of the military training academies. The Commission on Military Laws and Regulations is taking the Convention into consideration in the plans to remodel military regulations. The provisions of the Convention are also taken into account in the systematic procedure applied to ensure the protection of archaeological areas.

NETHERLANDS

Introduction

Measures were taken in the Netherlands even prior to the Second World War, albeit on a limited scale, to safeguard national art treasures in extraordinary circumstances. As a result of the 1958 ratification of the 1954 Convention of The Hague for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict, the Netherlands accepted also an international obligation to take appropriate steps and to make funds available to safeguard cultural property. In brief these measures are:

to provide fire prevention facilities such as sprinkler installations with independent water supplies and fixed extinguishing installations for and in a certain number of special immovable monuments and historic buildings; to make provisions to safeguard the fixed inventory items (which by their nature are immovable)

in these immovable monuments, such as pulpits, baptismal fonts, tombs, cenotaphs, stained glass and organs; to build, fit out, manage and maintain a number of national storage depots for art treasures; to draw up a list of the movable art treasures which in the event of extraordinary conditions prevailing should in any event be brought to a place of safety, and to take measures to ensure the transport to national storage depots; the setting up and maintenance of a culture protection agency with voluntary staff comprising provincial and area inspectors and 'monument guards' who can be called upon to protect cultural property.

The protection of cultural property in extraordinary circumstances is part of Civil Defence measures and comes under the responsibility of the Minister of Welfare, Health and Cultural Affairs (WVC).

All the activities in this field, including the financial aspects, are co-ordinated and frequently initiated by the Civil Defence and Protection Section (CVB) of the Ministry of Welfare, Health and Cultural Affairs.

The Minister is supported by the National Committee for the Protection of Monuments and Buildings of Historic Interest against disasters and risks of war, Division V of the Monuments Council.

Division V of the Monuments Council has the brief of providing the Minister for Welfare, Health and Cultural Affairs, at his request or on its own initiative, with information on the policy to be conducted in respect of the monuments and buildings designated by the Council.

Policy up to 1980

Up to 1980 the aim continued to be to safeguard movable cultural property in the event of war. The policy designed for this purpose was based on three premises, namely that in the event of armed conflict the major towns would be the target of terrorist attack, that there would be a warning time of at least a few days and that this period of time could be utilized for transferring the most important items of our cultural property to protected national storage depots located at an adequate distance from the major towns.

The location of the national storage depots necessitated large-scale transport operations sometimes covering fairly long distances. It was assumed that such operations could be completed before a conflict came to a head and possibly also before a mobilization had commenced.

Over the years doubt has arisen about the correctness of these premises. The likelihood of the major towns being the target has diminished. It became increasingly unrealistic to think that there would be a lengthy period of warning and military transport operations had become so extensive that in conjunction with the inevitable problem of refugees it was considered that the transport of cultural goods at this stage would be no longer possible or justified.

The solution to the problem was protection on the spot; storage locations in or in the immediate

vicinity of the normal accommodation. Protection on the spot also means that storage can be carried out by the staff themselves, quickly and without attracting attention.

There was another objection to the policy up to 1980. It was entirely geared to protection in the event of armed conflict. It provided no protection whatsoever against the more probable kinds of calamities, which may occur in peacetime: hurricane, flooding, major fires, riots, etc. Here, too, the warning time will usually be short and transport virtually an impossibility. Again, protection on the spot created new openings.

Policy after 1980

On 6 May 1980 the then Minister of Welfare Health and Cultural Affairs agreed with the proposals of the National Committee:

that greater effort should be made to protect cultural property on the spot, i. e. in the buildings (museums, art galleries, archives, libraries) themselves or in the near vicinity;

that rules should be drawn up so that every new building, extension, conversion or restoration should bear this requirement in mind;

that the directorate of institutions whose main and actual objective is to safeguard, exhibit or make available for study the movable cultural heritage of every people, i. e. museums, art galleries, archives, major libraries (certainly including national museums and art galleries, State archives and university libraries) should be asked to draw up an inventory of the facilities in or in the vicinity of the buildings in their custody with or without the addition of certain provisions;

that the directorates of these institutions should receive a manual so that they are aware of what is expected of them in this respect.

The new concept of protection on the spot thus acknowledges that in the event of calamities of whatever kind, both in peacetime and at war, there will neither be the time nor the opportunity to transport goods over longer distances.

The endeavour, therefore, as stated, is to find accommodation in the buildings themselves or in their immediate vicinity. In general, the storage locations on the spot will have to meet the following requirements. They must;

be located in or at a short distance from the normal accommodation of the objects in question;

be fire- and theft-proof;

preferably have a single entrance and no other access;

contain no pipes or wires passing through them; should these be present they must be capable of being disconnected outside the storage location;

be as damp-free as possible;

require no additional and expensive facilities (for example, air-conditioning) to make them suitable for housing persons;

be available at extremely short notice (use under normal circumstances is acceptable provided the storage place can be rapidly evacuated);

be sufficiently strong to resist rubble falling from buildings above or around.

If these requirements are met, a certain degree of protection against the repercussions of explosions will also be obtained.

It is tempting to express the requirements for the storage facilities on the spot in figures, such as pressure resistance, etc., but it must be realized that we are dealing here with quite different facilities from the national storage depots. The storage locations on the spot will provide greater protection than that of a normal location, but as a rule of a lower standard than that provided by the national storage depots. They must partly serve as a halfway house before subsequent transport to national storage depots at a point when circumstances permit and they will partly be the terminus for all art treasures which cannot be accommodated in national storage depots.

They will be designed for the role which they must play for the custodian in question and the nature of the objects which have to be stored.

The location and state of the facilities will differ considerably and it should be realized that it will almost always be a question of improving or strengthening existing facilities. Only a very few storage places will be entirely purpose-built.

Responsibility for the protection of the movable items of historic interest lies in the first instance with those to whose custody they have been assigned.

Consequently they are the ones who should investigate the possibility of acquiring storage locations on the spot either in their own buildings or in the immediate vicinity. Possibilities which spring to mind are bank vaults, solid cellars in buildings in the vicinity, underground garages, etc.

The majority of the potential storage places can only be used as such after certain provisions have been made, such as reinforcements, fire doors, wiring and pipeline detours, etc. The technical know-how required for this will usually be obtained from the national, provincial or local authorities under which the custodians fall.

Under the 1981 Calamities Act these authorities are obliged to participate in these operations.

Lastly, technical advice can be provided through the intermediary of the Ministry of Welfare, Health and Cultural Affairs.

The fitting out of the storage facilities on the spot will require financial sacrifices.

The costs for national museums and art galleries, archives and libraries, etc. will be borne by the State while other comparable institutions will, in principle, have to meet the costs themselves. Should they be unable to do so they will have to apply to the appropriate authority for grants: either the local authority, the provincial authority or a private body.

Since it is to be expected that in many cases these latter will have inadequate funds, the Ministry of Welfare, Health and Cultural Affairs will have to make arrangements so that additional funds can be allocated in each case.

Since government funds are not inexhaustible, projects will be dealt with in order of priority. The projects must take the form of plans with full technical and financial details and an indication of the additional funds required.

A list will also have to be given of what exactly is to be accommodated in the storage location. The criteria to be set will differ depending on the nature of the property to be stored; as far as dampness is concerned, different criteria apply to the storage of porcelain and to the storage of paintings.

The feasibility and costs of the projects submitted should be checked by the department.

Priorities should also be weighed in the light of the urgency and the money available for grants. The grants to be awarded will differ from case to case.

It is realized that this may lead to delicate situations, but such a scheme is unavoidable if one is to ensure that funds, which are always in short supply, are not spent on less urgent projects (where costs can be readily covered) at the expense of more pressing cases (with high costs) as would be the result were a fixed percentage to be awarded. Added to this is the fact that the financial capacities of the institutions and of the bodies providing grants at lower levels vary enormously.

Otherwise the requirements of a storage location are partly determined by the objects which are to be stored. For this reason alone, therefore, the custodians must draw up a plan of what is to be stored.

Under the Dutch Monuments Act the following elements or standards for protected monuments and buildings of historic interest (movable and immovable) are indicated when they are registered: age, art-historical importance, special architectural features, unique objects, location and purpose. It is prohibited under the Act to damage, destroy, demolish, alter or deface a protected monument. It is in this Act that the basis for protection lies, also in the case of disasters which can be anticipated when preventive measures against fire and theft are taken.

It is obvious that the policy changes described above require a new approach and that a new system can only be constructed step by step. This applies both to the choice of the objects to be protected and to the institutions where they are accommodated.

In consultation with the Directorate General for Cultural Affairs, it was consequently decided to make a start with five national museums and art galleries:

1. Rijksmuseum in Amsterdam;
2. Catharijne convent in Utrecht;
3. Mauritshuis in The Hague;
4. Rijksmuseum voor volkenkunde (National Ethnological Museum) in Leyden;
5. Justinus van Nassau Ethnological Museum in Breda.

The pumps and generators which are part of the fixed extinguishing installations in the Marekerk and the Pieterskerk in Leyden, the Stevenskerk in Nijmegen and the St. Servaaskerk and the St. Janstoren in Maastricht have been overhauled.

Organization of Volunteers (Protection of Monuments)

The Civil Defence and Protection Section which

co-ordinates all the activities on behalf of the Minister, as was mentioned above, is supported by an organization of volunteers comprising: provincial inspectors; inspector specialists; area inspectors; teams responsible for surveillance, rescue and fire tasks, the 'monument guards'.

The provincial inspectors co-ordinate the protective measures within their catchment area in close contact with the Queen's Commissioner in the province.

The area inspectors are responsible for protecting cultural property; they are also responsible for training and exercising the teams.

The inspector specialists are responsible for items within their specialization such as stained glass, carillons, clocks, organs and technical installations. They advise provincial and area inspectors on these matters as well as owners and museum directors.

The protection of monuments is concerned with:

- (a) the protection of movable and immovable property which is of great importance to the cultural heritage of every people;
- (b) the buildings of which the main and actual function is to safeguard cultural property or to exhibit it (museums, art galleries, archives and libraries) as well as the storage location designed to provide protection for the cultural property in the event of armed conflict;
- (c) providing the immovable monuments and buildings listed under (b) with a distinctive emblem, a single blue and white shield;
- (d) providing cultural property, which if certain conditions are met, must be given special protection and is registered internationally, with three shields in triangular formation (the six national storage depots in the Netherlands);
- (e) safeguarding cultural property by taking measures in peacetime (normal circumstances) against the repercussions of disasters which can be anticipated, etc.

Instructions for provincial inspectors for the protection of cultural property were issued by decree of 10 May 1968 and instructions for area inspectors were issued by a decree of 15 December 1973.

These instructions are being put into effect by the CVB section at present.

The legal status of monument inspectors is regulated in the Besluit Monumentenwachters (Monument Inspectors Decree) 1965, Bulletin of Acts, Orders and Decrees 477.

In view of the developments in the field of the protection of monuments and historic buildings, the present Monuments Inspection Decree which is in force, should be regarded as obsolete and no longer adequate.

In September 1982 a draft for a new Protection of Monuments and Historic Buildings Decree was sent to the Ministry of Home Affairs for further consultation.

The Royal Armed Forces have appointed cultural property officers (reserve staff) with a view to take military measures to protect cultural property.

Their responsibilities are as follows:

(a) to ensure that respect is shown for cultural property in the event of an armed conflict by refraining from its use or that of its immediate vicinity;

(b) to take measures under the terms of the Convention to prohibit, prevent or put a stop to theft, plundering, removal and vandalism of cultural property by military personnel;

(c) in peacetime (during initial exercises and follow-up exercises) to instil in members of the armed forces a spirit of respect for cultural property of one's own and other nations and to draw up instructions and rules for implementing the Convention of The Hague.

Moreover, military personnel are given instructions on the significance of the emblem as referred to in Article 16 of the Convention by means of a film, while the Convention is also referred to in documents issued to military personnel.

Briefing

To enhance the good relations and co-operation between the military and civil staff responsible for protective measures (specifically the organization of volunteers) a meeting was held on 4 June 1982 between the two groups at which various aspects of their responsibilities were discussed.

Publicity has been given to the Convention of The Hague in recent years by means of television and radio broadcasts and the dissemination of brochures on the responsibilities and objectives in relation to the protection of cultural property.

The brochure that was sent last year to all burgomasters and major provincial and municipal agencies is still an item of interest in the Dutch daily press.

Documentation

In the field of photogrammetry the CVB section now has at its disposal over 1,000 3D records on polyester film of movable and immovable monuments. In 1982, a photogrammetric record was made of an eighteenth century pulpit and the Moreau organ in the St. Janskerk in Gouda. The exterior of this church was also recorded and drawn. A number of special choir stalls and the choir gate and the chancel have also been recorded in the A-Kerk in Groningen. In 1983, the cupola and the lateral facades of the Palace on Dam Square in Amsterdam will be recorded by means of photogrammetry.

Meanwhile, many Dutch listed monuments and historic buildings have been provided with the emblem as referred to in Article 16 of the Convention.

Commissioner-General for Cultural Property

Mr R. Hotke, Director-General for Cultural Affairs of the Ministry of Welfare, Health and

Cultural Affairs, has been nominated as qualified to fulfil the function of Commissioner-General for Cultural Property, in accordance with the provision of Article 1 of the Regulation for the execution of the Convention.

NIGERIA

During the Nigerian Civil War of 1966-1970, the Oron Museum was destroyed and was not rebuilt until 1976.

Oron ancestral figures of the Cross River State were removed by mercenaries and voluntary organizations from where they were kept at the Government College, Umuahia. Of these carvings, numbering about 800 before the war, less than 200 are now left in Nigeria.

Nigeria is contemplating bringing out a book on these art pieces within the next year, stating that they were removed during the period of armed conflict in Nigeria in the hope that those who now possess them will know that they do so in contravention of the Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict (1954).

Measures have also been taken for the special protection and respect of our cultural property by refraining from any use of the cultural property and its immediate surroundings or of the appliances used for its protection for purposes which are likely to expose them to further destruction or damage.

Finally, to strengthen the efforts being made to protect the Nigerian heritage from wanton destruction both during peace and wartime, the National Commission for Museums and Monuments has adopted a policy which makes it illegal to export our cultural property or any work of art without the Commission's permission.

NORWAY

The Norwegian report published by Unesco in 1979 covers the recommendations made by 'The Committee for Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict' to the Norwegian Ministry of Defence on 25 June 1969. The recommendations as presented by the Committee are still to be realized, but some practical steps have been taken in the civilian sphere.

In 1982, the Director-General of the Central Office of Historic Monuments, Dr Stephan Tschudi-Madsen, was designated as qualified to fulfil the functions of Commissioner-General for Cultural Property. In 1983 he took the initiative of reorganizing the plans for the protection of cultural property. For this purpose a study group formed of alumni students of the Defence College has been established to deal with the problems from the military point of view. This group co-operates with a team of representatives of the administration of cultural property and the Chairman of the Board of Norwegian Museums of Art and Social

History under the supervision of the Director-General of the Central Office of Historic Monuments.

In the civilian sector, some important precautions have been taken at the local level. The first task now is to obtain a general view of the problems concerning the museums, archives and libraries of the country. This will be done in full collaboration with the Norwegian Museums of Art and Social History.

A county in southern Norway has been chosen as a 'testing area' for the plans of the whole country.

POLAND

General comments

As Poland has not been involved in an armed conflict since 1945, the occasion has not arisen to implement most of the Convention's provisions (particularly Articles 5, 8, 9, 10-22).

As regards those provisions which apply equally in times of peace, Polish legislation has for a long time been in accordance with these prescriptions and even goes beyond them on some points, both as regards the definition of cultural property and as regards the methods used.

Besides the law of 15 February 1962 on the protection of cultural property and on museums, which is a substantial step in this field, the Polish legislative system includes decrees, ordinances and governmental decisions specifying and laying down obligations with respect to the protection of cultural property.

At the international level, where the Hague Convention has been a precedent and has given rise to various activities concerning the protection of cultural property, other instruments have been drawn up to which Poland has been a signatory. The Polish delegation has always taken an active part in formulating these instruments (the 1972 Convention on the protection of the world cultural and natural heritage; the 1976 Recommendation concerning the safeguarding and contemporary role of historic areas, etc.), without ever having any difficulty in implementing them in Poland, since Polish legislation accords with their provisions.

This said, we would like to point out that our reply concerns only some aspects of the Convention and that in general terms it refers the reader to previous reports.

Article 3 of the Convention

Inventories (registers) of movable items of cultural property are held in all voivodships under the control of the voivodship Curator of historic monuments. At the present time they include not only isolated monuments but also historic ensembles and districts in towns, gardens, cemeteries, and archaeological sites. They also cover monuments built at the turn of the century and in the twentieth century. The work of

identifying the monuments, making up indexes and carrying out research is done first and foremost by the Documentation Centre for Cultural Property in Warsaw and also by the Documentation Bureaux attached to the Curators of Monuments in the voivodships. There are also other institutions working on the identification of cultural property, such as the Institute of Art of the Polish Academy of Science, the Schools of Advanced Studies in Art and Architecture, and the museums. The conservation workshops (PKZ) deal with documentation on the conservation work they carry out. This documentation is drawn up before and after conservation work.

The provisions for the identification of monuments were amplified and clarified in a decree by the Minister for Culture and the Arts dated 5 July 1968.

At present, attention is being given to documenting historic towns and districts, 500 of which have been listed for rehabilitation. One important archaeological project has been completed with the preparation of a map of all the archaeological sites in Poland, together with the relevant documentation.

In 1978, the Council of Ministers set up an interministerial commission on the problems of rehabilitating historic towns and ensembles. This commission gives very effective assistance in applying the provisions of the 1962 law on the protection of cultural property and museums. No less important has been the inclusion of problems concerning the safeguarding of historic monuments in the territorial planning with which the 1980 law on land-use planning is concerned.

The 1962 law on the protection of cultural property has for the past twenty years been the essence of Poland's legislation on the safeguarding of cultural property. In 1981, it was subjected to close scrutiny, and draft amendments have been drawn up by a group of specialists and sent to the Interministerial Commission, after which they will be put before the Diet.

Article 4

Under the 1962 law, the penalty for offences against the regulations concerning cultural property can reach a maximum of five years' imprisonment.

Detailed instructions have been published jointly by the Minister for Culture and the Arts and the Minister of Defence. These instructions concern the measures to be taken to preserve cultural property in the event of armed conflict, and in particular its evacuation and transport or its preservation in refuges especially fitted out for this purpose. However, these measures would not be adequate in the event of a nuclear conflict.

Article 8

Poland has not availed itself of the privilege of special protection provided for under this article. On the other hand, a number of composite historic sites of outstanding value in our country have been entered on the List of World Monuments drawn up

under the 1972 Convention. These complexes, particularly Krakow, the old town of Warsaw and the Wieliczka salt mines, enjoy special national and international protection. A Unesco subsidy has been granted for the rehabilitation of Krakow.

Article 25

The provisions of the Convention and other legal instruments concerning cultural property are widely circulated in Poland, not only through specialist periodicals but also in the newspapers and on radio and television. The Polish ICOMOS committee is very actively involved in publicizing these problems by organizing conferences, meetings and symposia on these subjects and publishing their conclusions.

SAUDI ARABIA

The Ministry of Education's General Department of Antiquities and Museums has made good use of the Convention on the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict, the provisions of which are in harmony with those of the legislation on antiquities currently in force in the Kingdom. This legislation is in the form of royal decree No. M/26 of 23 June 1992 H. Many of the articles and paragraphs in this decree define cultural property (both movable and immovable), proclaim the need for preserving historic sites, safeguarding archaeological monuments and sites, restoring them and presenting them in an appropriate way. It is also forbidden to damage antiquities of any kind, alter them, deface them or modify their characteristics.

In addition, a number of regulations have been adopted in order to safeguard archaeological monuments and sites which are in danger of being damaged.

A large number of depots and modern buildings have been opened so as to place items of cultural property in a safe place and preserve them.

It should be noted that this Convention, in Section III (Transport), does not indicate the best materials to be used for packing movable items of cultural property in order to give them maximum protection during loading, unloading and temporary storage and protect them from atmospheric changes.

Finally, there is no specific provision obliging States Parties to the Convention to give government guarantees indemnifying against damage or theft suffered by articles on loan.

SPAIN

(a) The preparation of the list of items of cultural property as defined under Article 1 of the Convention has begun. This list, which is practically identical to the list recently transmitted to the World Heritage Committee, still

has to be revised by the appropriate organizations, chiefly the Ministry of Defence.

(b) A handbook of provisions of a protective nature to be applied in the event of armed conflict is currently being drafted. Such measures would include the setting up of local, provincial and regional councils for the protection of the artistic heritage, and the corresponding bodies for the recovery and requisitioning of such property.

(c) Consideration is also being given to a handbook of provisions of a preventive nature, to be applied in museums and cultural centres. These would include the provision of protective shelters, special rooms for the safeguarding of documents, fire precautions, etc.

(d) Work is progressing steadily on the comprehensive, detailed documenting of the entire architectural heritage, in accordance with an established order of priorities. All these materials will be of immense value in the event of part or parts of Spain's heritage of buildings suffering deterioration or being destroyed.

(e) Contacts have been established with the Ministry of Defence with a view to ensuring implementation of the provisions of the Convention.

(f) A joint meeting of the Spanish parties concerned by the question (Ministry of Culture, Ministry of Defence, Red Cross, etc.) will take place shortly in order to co-ordinate activities and to ensure that the provisions of the Convention are applied gradually but in the near future.

SWITZERLAND

Switzerland acceded to the Hague Convention in 1962, and then in 1966 passed a law which came into effect in 1968 with an implementing regulation. In addition, instructions have been issued on the following points: construction of refuges (1978); staff organization, training and action (1981); documents and reproductions (1982). The Federal law on civil defence (1962) also plays an important part in the protection of cultural property.

Each of the twenty-six cantons has its official specialist on the protection of cultural property. The co-ordination and subsidizing of protection measures are handled by a Federal department which is part of the Federal Bureau of Culture. In order to co-ordinate all civil defence measures, this department is to be transferred on 1 January 1984 to the Federal Civil Defence Bureau. The Swiss Committee for the Protection of Cultural Property acts as a consultative body for the more important questions. It is made up of twenty-one members nominated by the Federal Council and includes representatives of all the political and cultural groups concerned.

Any commune holding important items of cultural property names a delegate responsible for their protection. This delegate is a member of the local civil defence general staff, and even in peacetime ensures that all the necessary measures are taken. It is estimated that a staff of some 15,000 would be needed throughout the country in

the event of war or disaster. Their training is governed by the law, but to date has only been provided in a few cantons. Staff are provided with arm-bands and identity cards.

Six hundred and fifty buildings of national importance are on the list of cultural property for which, in 1978, the Federal Council authorized the use of the blue and white shield. The shield has been publicized by a special postage stamp, and an explanatory leaflet is being planned. These shields, 128 x 90,5 cm and made of a weather-resistant material, will be issued to the cantons in 1984.

A topographical map (1:300,000), the third edition of which is now being prepared, shows very many objects worthy of protection. In addition, a map of the museums (1:300,000) was published in 1982. This shows the country's 600 or so museums with their exact addresses and their opening hours. Switzerland's artistic and historic monuments are now also scientifically presented, and in detail, in a series of 70 richly illustrated books.

A special working group of the National Committee has drawn up the inventory of buildings and sites in categories A (of national importance) and B (of regional importance). These categories are eligible for Federal subsidies. The inventory is to be published in the very near future, and is in the nature of a programme for all the protection measures to come.

Some seventy refuges, located in the immediate vicinity of the peacetime locations of the movable objects concerned, have been built with the financial help of the Confederation. Unfortunately only 10 per cent of the museums have been provided with a refuge. The situation is hardly any better for archives and libraries. Private owners of cultural property have done very little. The Confederation, for its part, opened a depot of microfilms on cultural subjects in 1979, at Heimiswil, 20 km from Berne. A copy of every film made with the Confederation's financial aid is deposited in this refuge, a 2,100 m² cave. This depot is also a regional refuge.

Very many of the 400 Federal subsidies so far allocated have been for fire alarm systems, photographic inventories and collections of photogrammetric survey records. A programme of aerial photogrammetric surveys of the roofs of some 100 historic sites has been financed by the Confederation. Federal subsidies cover 25 to 50 per cent of the costs.

The protection of cultural property is always introduced into the periodic general defence exercises, both national and regional. It is nevertheless the case that one cannot count on absolute consideration for cultural property by the armed forces, and this makes peacetime efforts, now, all the more necessary.

SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC

We are pleased to inform you hereby that the Syrian Arab Republic has taken the following

action with respect to the implementation of the Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict:

Sets of maps have been issued to the armed forces, showing sites and buildings of historic interest. The Ministry of Defence has distributed these to all military units with instructions to keep well away from historic sites and buildings and not to use them for military purposes.

A number of articles have been printed in military publications on the subject of the Convention, explaining its content and objectives and the duties it imposes on members of the armed forces both in peace and in wartime.

People's organizations such as the Peasants' Union have been provided, through the medium of the newspaper *Nidal al-fallahin* ('The Peasants' Struggle'), with explanations of and information about the Convention, so that peasants' associations can become familiar with it; this is a step that goes back to 1970.

Information and comment on the Convention are circulated among the general public from time to time through the media, including radio, television, newspapers and magazines.

The emblem of the Convention has been permanently displayed on the roofs and walls of buildings of historic interest to indicate that the buildings in question have been classified as historic monuments.

THAILAND

1. The Report of Thailand on the Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict is prepared by the Directorate of Joint Operations, Ministry of Defence. This report is made in reference to Article 26, paragraph 2, of the Convention under the terms of which the High Contracting Parties, including Thailand, have to forward periodically a report to the Director-General of Unesco.

2. In view of the implementation of the Convention, the Ministry of Defence of Thailand has given information on the Convention to commissioned officers and other ranks and to some government officials by means of instructions and training.

3. A training course on 'How to follow-up the Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict' has been held every year by Supreme Command Headquarters. The details of the Convention are mentioned in the History and Museums' Course of the Directorate of Education and Research given to the soldiers. The above-mentioned training has also been given in the Armed Forces Staff College.

4. To disseminate the text of the Convention and inform military personnel about it, a special course concerning the Convention has been given in the Royal Thai Army, the Royal Thai Navy and the Royal Thai Air Force.

5. As for the Royal Thai Army, the names of the military agencies responsible for training and the number of trainees and hours from

1979-1982 are as follows: Institute of Army Academies (921 trainees; 12 hours); Directorate of Logistics (241 trainees; 18 hours); Directorate of Intelligence (223 trainees; 10 hours); Adjutant-General's Department (413 trainees; 20 hours); Chulachomklao Royal Military Academy (1,200 trainees; 16 hours); Transportation Department (927 trainees; 40 hours); Medical Department (1,589 trainees; 280 hours).

6. From the Royal Thai Navy's report, a great number of military trainees can be seen as follows: Naval Administration Department (814 trainees; 63 hours); Royal Thai Marine Corps (2,342 trainees; 62 hours); Naval Education Department (30,358 trainees; 19 hours); Naval Communications Department (429 trainees; 6 hours); Sattahip Naval Base, Choburi (89 trainees; 3 hours); Bangkok Naval Station (1,084 trainees; 100 hours).

7. It is not reported by the Royal Thai Air Force how many trainees attend the course. Nevertheless, the military agencies concerned are as follows: Air Command and Staff College (3 hours); Airmen's Command School (4 hours); Royal Thai Air Force Academy (4 hours); Airmen's Technical Training School (2 hours).

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

The relevant bodies in the USSR regularly take appropriate measures in fulfilment of Article 26 of the Hague Convention on the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict.

Recently, Soviet specialists concerned with the safeguarding of monuments examined national legislation relating to the safeguarding of historical and cultural monuments. At a session of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, a Law of the USSR on 'The safeguarding and use of historical and cultural monuments' was adopted.

The Law reflects the principles of the Hague Convention on the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict and the Unesco Convention for the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (1972), as well as the idea of the development of cultural relations and exchanges formulated in the third section of the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (Helsinki, 1975).

The Law states that 'the historical and cultural monuments of the people of the USSR form an integral part of the world cultural heritage and testify to the great contribution made by the peoples of our country to the development of world civilization'.

The Law on 'The safeguarding and use of historical and cultural monuments' includes articles classifying the objects qualifying as historical and cultural monuments, established State registration procedures and regulates questions of legal safeguards. The law reflects principles set forth in a number of Unesco documents, e. g. the Recommendation concerning the Preservation

of Cultural Property endangered by Public or Private Works (1968), the Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property (1970) and the Convention for the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (1972). Account was also taken of the Unesco Recommendation concerning the International Exchange of Cultural Property (1976).

The Law on 'The safeguarding and use of historical and cultural monuments' came into force on 1 March 1977. Similar laws were also introduced in the Union Republics.

All this bears witness to the attention paid by the State to the safeguarding of monuments and reflects the growing public interest in protection of the cultural heritage.

It is characteristic of the USSR that discussion of the Law should have been public. The active role of public organizations and of the population at large is well illustrated by the following figures: in 1970, the number of people involved in societies for the safeguarding of monuments in the various Republics totalled 12 million, in 1976 it was 31.7 million, while at the present time the figure is in excess of 46.7 million.

At the end of 1982, the Government of the USSR approved the 'Regulations governing the safeguarding and use of historical and cultural monuments' - a statutory instrument providing for the establishment of specific rules for the safeguarding, use and restoration of monuments, for carrying out State registration, for the creation and safeguarding of historic and cultural reserves and for decisions on other normative questions relating to the implementation of the Law of the USSR on the safeguarding and use of historical and cultural monuments.

In the period since the adoption of the 1976 Law, over 35,000 more historical, archaeological, urban, architectural and artistic monuments, ensembles and complexes have been declared, registered and brought within the protection of the State in the USSR. The overall number of monuments under the protection of the State thus currently stands at over 185,000.

The year 1984 will mark the thirtieth anniversary of the Hague Convention on the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict, which has played a useful part in the protection of property in the course of armed conflicts. However, as a result of the growth of military technology, such property is increasingly subject to the risk of destruction. The advent of nuclear weapons has turned the threat to cultural property into a global one.

On the initiative of the USSR, the United Nations General Assembly at its thirty-eighth session considered and adopted by an overwhelming majority three resolutions: 'The freezing of nuclear weapons', 'The condemnation of nuclear war' and 'Averting the arms race in outer space', which in present circumstances represents a contribution to the implementation and development of the 1954 Hague Convention on the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict.