

The Impact of Uniform Laws on the Protection of Cultural Heritage and the Preservation of Cultural Heritage in the 21st Century

Edited by
Toshiyuki Kono



MARTINUS

NIJHOFF

PUBLISHERS

LEIDEN • BOSTON
2010

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

The impact of uniform laws on the protection of cultural heritage and the preservation of cultural heritage in the 21st century / edited by Toshiyuki Kono.

p. cm.

Includes index.

ISBN 978-90-04-18044-4 (hardback : alk. paper) 1. Cultural property—Protection (International law) 2. Cultural property—Protection—Law and legislation. I. Kono, Toshiyuki.

K3791.I43 2010

344.09—dc22

2010011393

ISBN 978 90 04 18044 4

Copyright 2010 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands.
Koninklijke Brill NV incorporates the imprints Brill, Hotei Publishing,
IDC Publishers, Martinus Nijhoff Publishers and VSP.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Koninklijke Brill NV provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910, Danvers, MA 01923, USA.
Fees are subject to change.



Mixed Sources

Product group from well-managed forests
and other controlled sources
www.fsc.org Cert no. SGS-COC-008787
©1996 Forest Stewardship Council

PRINTED BY A-D DRUK BV - ZEIST, THE NETHERLANDS

CONTENTS

General Report	
<i>Toshiyuki Kono and Stefan Wrbka</i>	1
Introduction / Prologue	4

PART I—INTERNATIONAL LEGAL FRAMEWORK

1. Cultural Heritage Protection: A Story of Several Beginnings— or: The Pre-UNESCO Period	10
2. Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict (1954)	16
3. UNESCO Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property (1970)	32
4. Convention for the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (1972)	43
5. UNIDROIT Convention on Stolen or Illegally Exported Cultural Objects (1995)	59
6. Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage (2001)	70
7. Convention for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage (2003)	82
8. Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions (2005)	96
9. Conclusion	108

PART II—NATIONAL LEGAL FRAMEWORKS

1. General Issues	112
2. Tangible Cultural Heritage	136
3. Intangible Cultural Heritage	205
4. Epilogue	223
Table—Status of National Ratification/Acceptance of International Tools	231

Canada

Robert K. Paterson

1. General Issues	233
2. Tangible Cultural Heritage	235
3. Intangible Cultural Heritage	243
4. Beyond Preservation	246

Croatia

Igor Gliha and Tatjana Josipović

1. General Issues	247
2. Tangible Cultural Heritage	252
3. Intangible Cultural Heritage	268
4. Beyond Preservation	276
5. Abbreviations	279

Czech Republic

Pavel Šturma

1. General Issues	281
2. Tangible Cultural Heritage	284
3. Intangible Cultural Heritage	292
4. Beyond Preservation	292
5. Miscellaneous	292

Denmark

Ditlev Tamm and Anne Østrup

1. Introduction	297
2. Protection and Preservation of the Danish Tangible Cultural Heritage	301
3. Safeguarding the Archeological Heritage	325
4. Safeguarding Cultural Heritage in the Event of an Armed Conflict	330
5. Protection and Preservation of the Danish Intangible Cultural Heritage	333
6. Conclusion	335

France

Marie Cornu

1. General Issues	341
2. Tangible Cultural Heritage	358

3. Intangible Cultural Heritage	412
4. Beyond Preservation	414
5. Miscellaneous	415
6. Annexe	417

Germany

Kurt Siehr

1. Cultural Matters in Germany: Legislative Power	422
2. Protection Cultural; Property: Sources	423
3. Cultural Property	425
4. Immovables	430
5. Movables	433
6. Intangible Cultural Property	436
7. Measures Beyond Preservation?	436
8. Recent Trends	436
9. Summary	437

Italy

Federico Lenzerini

1. General Background	439
2. Categorization of Cultural Heritage in Italian Law	441
3. Rights over Cultural Heritage	444
4. Protection of Tangible Cultural Heritage	450
5. Protection of Intangible Cultural Heritage	462
6. Conclusion	463
7. Additional Information	464

Japan

Toshiyuki Kono

1. Historical Development of the Protection of Cultural Heritage in Japan	469
2. The Current Protection Scheme Under the Law for the Protection of Cultural Property	474
3. Tangible Cultural Heritage	478
4. Intangible Cultural Heritage	487
5. Beyond Preservation	492
6. Conclusion	493

Mexico

Jorge Sánchez Cordero

1. Introduction	497
2. The Mexican Legal Order Functionality	498
3. General Issues	503
4. The Mexican Institutions Charged with the Protection of Mexican Archeological Sites	547
5. The Fatigue of the Nationalistic Cultural Heritage Model, the Emergence of the Multilateral Model	551
6. Conclusions	558

Netherlands

Katja Lubina

1. Introduction and Key Facts of the Legal System of the Netherlands	563
2. General Issues	565
3. Tangible Cultural Heritage	574
4. Intangible Cultural Heritage	624
5. Bibliography	634

New Zealand / Aotearoa

Paul Myburgh

1. General Issues	640
2. Tangible Cultural Heritage	645
3. Intangible Cultural Heritage	658
4. Beyond Preservation	662

Spain

Sofía de Salas

1. General Issues	664
2. Scope of LHHS and Categories of Cultural Heritage Conceptualized in It	667
3. Tangible Cultural Heritage	673
4. Intangible Cultural Heritage	684

Switzerland

Eva Maria Belser, Eva Rüegg and Eva Molinari

1. General Issues	692
2. The Protection of Tangible Cultural Heritage	694
3. The Protection of Intangible Cultural Heritage	714
4. Appendix: Legal Sources	743

Taiwan

Ming-Yan Shieh and Chung-Hsi Lee

1. General Issues	745
2. Tangible Cultural Heritage	748
3. Intangible Cultural Heritage	754
4. Beyond Preservation	756

United States

James A.R. Nafziger

1. General Issues	757
2. Tangible Cultural Heritage	758
3. Intangible Cultural Heritage	770
4. Miscellaneous Provisions	771

Index	773
-------------	-----

GENERAL REPORT

Toshiyuki Kono*
and Stefan Wrška**

Introduction/Prologue	4
-----------------------------	---

PART I—INTERNATIONAL LEGAL FRAMEWORK

1. Cultural Heritage Protection: A Story of Several Beginnings—or: The Pre-UNESCO Period	10
2. Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict (1954)	16
2.1. The 1954 Convention: Facing the Threats of Armed Conflicts	16
2.1.1. Background of the 1954 Convention: Wartime Destruction	16
2.1.2. Scope of Application of the 1954 Convention and the Term Cultural Property	17
2.1.3. Legal Framework of the 1954 Convention: Safeguarding and Respect	21
2.2. First Protocol to the 1954 Convention: Dealing with the Threat of Exploitation	23
2.2.1. Background and Scope of Application of the First Protocol to the 1954 Convention: The Battle Against a Growing Black Market	23
2.2.2. Legal Framework of the First Protocol: Short But Better Than Nothing	25
2.3. Second Protocol to the 1954 Convention: An Answer to a Toothless Instrument	26
2.3.1. Background of the Second Protocol: Dealing with the Shortcomings of the 1954 Convention	26
2.3.2. Important Cornerstones of the Second Protocol: Enhancing the 1954 Framework	27

* Professor of Law, Kyushu University; LL.B., LL.M. (University of Kyoto).

** Former Assistant Professor of Law, Kyushu University; Mag. iur., Dr. iur. (University of Vienna), LL.M. (Kyushu University).

3. UNESCO Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property (1970)	32
3.1. Background of the 1970 Convention: Readjusting the Efforts in the Battle Against Illicit Trafficking	32
3.2. Scope of Application of the 1970 Convention: In Wartime and Peacetime	35
3.3. The Three Pillars of the 1970 Convention: Prevention, Restitution and International Cooperation	38
3.4. Excursus: Intergovernmental Committee for Promoting the Return of Cultural Property to its Countries of Origin or its Restitution in case of Illicit Appropriation and the Fund of the International Committee	42
4. Convention for the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (1972)	43
4.1. Background of the 1972 Convention: Combining Treasures of Culture and Nature	43
4.2. Scope of Application of the 1972 Convention and the Concept of Outstanding Universal Value	45
4.3. Legal Framework and Mechanism of the 1972 Convention: The Creation of a Model Convention	51
5. UNIDROIT Convention on Stolen or Illegally Exported Cultural Objects (1995)	59
5.1. Background of the 1995 UNIDROIT Convention: Private Law as the Key to Regulating the Black Market	59
5.2. Drafting of the 1995 UNIDROIT Convention: The Long and Winding Road	60
5.3. Scope of Application of the 1995 UNIDROIT Convention: Focus on Recovery	62
5.4. Legal Framework and basic principles of the 1995 UNIDROIT Convention: Acts of Balancing	66
6. Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage (2001)	70
6.1. Excursus: The United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea of 1982 or Mission Incomplete	70
6.2. Background of the 2001 Convention: Fishing for a Solution	72
6.3. Scope of Application of the 2001 Convention: Underwater Richness	74
6.4. Legal Framework of the 2001 Convention: Preservation and Prohibition of Exploitation	76
7. Convention for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage (2003)	82

7.1. Brief Overview and the Drafting Process of the 2003 Convention: What about Intangibles?	82
7.2. Scope of Application of the 2003 Convention: Safeguarding, Not Just Protecting	87
7.3. Legal Framework and Mechanism of the 2003 Convention: Adopting and Adapting the 1972 Model	91
8. Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions (2005)	96
8.1. Background of the 2005 Convention: Cultural Diversity and the Threat of Globalization	96
8.2. Scope of Application and the terms Cultural Diversity and Cultural Expressions: Building the Third Pillar	100
8.3. Legal Framework and Mechanism of the 2005 Convention: How to Handle the Dual Nature of Cultural Goods and Services	104
9. Conclusion	108

PART II—NATIONAL LEGAL FRAMEWORKS

1. General Issues	112
1.1. National Legal Frameworks	112
1.1.1. The National Fundament: The Constitutional Pillar—Diversity on the Constitutional level	112
1.1.2. The National Legal Material Body or How to Bring Cultural Heritage Concepts to Life: Sub-Constitutional Law—Diversity on the Instrumental Level	116
1.2. Basic National Concepts of Cultural Heritage—The Underlying Rationale of Its Protection and Preservation	126
1.2.1. Basic Points of Interest	126
1.2.2. National Approaches	126
2. Tangible Cultural Heritage	136
2.1. Immovable Tangible Cultural Heritage	136
2.1.1. General Issues	136
2.1.2. General National Legal System with Regard to the Protection and Preservation of Immovable Tangible Cultural Heritage	137
2.1.3. Conclusion	157
2.2. Movable Tangible Cultural Heritage	162
2.2.1. General Issues	162

2.2.2. General National Legal System with Regard to the Protection and Preservation of Movable Tangible Cultural Heritage	163
2.2.3. Conclusion	184
2.3. Special National Regulations with Regard to the Protection and Preservation of Movable Tangible Cultural Heritage in Armed Conflicts	190
2.3.1. General Issues	190
2.3.2. National Protective Regimes for Tangible Cultural Heritage in Relation to Armed Conflicts	191
2.3.3. Conclusion	195
2.4. Special National Regulations with Regard to the Protection and Preservation of Underwater Movable Tangible Cultural Heritage	197
2.4.1. General Issues	197
2.4.2. National Protective Regimes for Underwater Tangible Cultural Heritage	198
2.4.3. Conclusion	203
3. Intangible Cultural Heritage	205
3.1. General Issues	205
3.2. National Approaches	205
3.2.1. Countries with Special Regulations	206
3.2.2. Countries with Special Regulations (also) on a Regional Basis	209
3.2.3. Countries without a (special) legal regime of intangible cultural heritage protection	214
3.2.4. The New Zealand Model	219
3.3. Conclusion	220
4. Epilogue	223
Table—Status of National Ratification/Acceptance of International Tools	231

INTRODUCTION / PROLOGUE

Cultural heritage has come to be viewed as a shared common interest of humanity, to be kept safe and protected under the auspices of international law. From the early interest of the international community in protecting cultural properties and masterpieces during periods of armed conflict, this interest has expanded and evolved to include the properties and tangible materials of peoples during peaceful times as well as the very people who embody, create and recreate these cultures—the living, breathing heritage,

culminating in the latest point of interest of international cultural heritage protection and preservation: intangible cultural heritage.

Safeguarding efforts have also extended to cultural heritage underwater and the campaign against the illicit trade of cultural objects. Moreover, other cultural values have come into play. These include the protection of natural heritage, closely linked to environmental issues, or the respect for human dignity and the human rights of individuals and communities, particularly those of indigenous peoples and minority groups.

In general, the development of approaches to safeguarding cultural heritage at the international level has been quite slow and fragmented. Initially, there seemed to be little awareness about the safeguarding of cultural heritage. More recently, however, one can see that—though still fragmented—the trend in global thinking is moving towards a more comprehensive regime of cultural heritage protection and preservation, expressed through the various conventions established at the international level and grounded on the principles of cultural internationalism while reaffirming cultural nationalism.

Cultural property internationalism is a rather new phenomenon whereby everyone has an interest in the preservation and enjoyment of cultural property wherever it is situated and from whatever cultural or geographic source it derives.¹ Cultural property is viewed as the ‘collective cultural heritage of all people.’² Thus, the international community considers the privileges of the common global interest and the right to intervene and ensure its protection as paramount over the rights of any particular nation. This view is, however, tempered by *cultural nationalism*, which is the view that ‘cultural property is a part of the cultural heritage of the nation in which it is found or the nation which contains the cultural descendants of its creator.’³ The principle of state sovereignty underlies this perspective. A state has the jurisdiction and the right to exercise control over matters within its territorial boundaries. This position is generally taken by source nations. Thus, the various international and supranational laws will continue to be influenced by domestic legislation and *vice versa*, and any level of uniformity of such national laws will shape the future international norms on cultural heritage protection and preservation in the 21st century. Combining both international and national cultural heritage protection into one study also means taking into account both movements, the concept of *cultural property internationalism* as well as the

¹ J.H. Merryman, ‘Cultural Property Internationalism’, 12 *International Journal of Cultural Property* (2005) p. 11 at p. 11.

² J. Warring, ‘Underground Debates: The Fundamental Differences of Opinion That Thwart UNESCO’s Progress in Fighting the Illicit Trade in Cultural Property’, 19 *Emory International Law Review* (2005) p. 227 at p. 247.

³ Warring, loc. cit. n. 2, at p. 247.

concept of *cultural nationalism*, as both interact with each other and cannot be regarded as totally separate concepts.

The idea of writing this report was born on the occasion of the 1st Intermediate Congress of the International Academy of Comparative Law in Mexico concerning 'The Impact of Uniform Law on National Law. Limits and Possibilities', which took place in November of 2008.⁴ Zweigert and Kötz define the term *unification of law*—deriving from the latin terms *unus* ('one') and *facere* ('to make')—, the fundamentals of *uniform law* deriving from the latin terms *unus* and *forma* ('form')—, as 'a discipline of legal policy which aims at settling or removing differences of national legislation through a consensus in international legal principles within the limits of desirability and possibility.'⁵ They go on to define the international procedure used for the unification of national laws as 'being of the kind that an *Einheitsgesetz* (*loi uniforme*, *uniform law*) will be drafted by experts in the field of comparative law and put into a collective treaty which mandates its states parties to implement and transform this *uniform law* into national law (note: as long as the international tool is not self-executing⁶).'⁷ Fox expressively refers to the work of the international community defining the term *unification of laws* as 'efforts by a number of international organizations to make the municipal laws of the countries of a region or the entire world as uniform as possible, thus, eliminating conflicts of laws problems',⁸ while Black's Law Dictionary defines the term (note: United States) *uniform law* as a '...law proposed as legislation for all the states to adopt exactly as written, the purpose being to promote greater consistency among the states.'⁹

It should be noted that the concept of international and national cultural heritage protection and preservation is a very broad concept touching issues related to public law as well as private law, both on an international level as well as on a national level. Thus within the scope of this report, the term *uniform law* shall be understood in a broader and less strict meaning, leading to a kind of *soft* uniform law. In particular obligations arising from international public law tools cannot unify national laws completely. They can however express the concerns of the international community and provide a model which national legislation should follow. Hence, international cultural

⁴ Information about this congress can be found online at http://www.iuscomparatum.org/offres/gestion/menu_141_perso_141_1837/mexico-congress-2008.html (last visited on December 31, 2008).

⁵ K. Zweigert and H. Kötz, *Einführung in die Rechtsvergleichung* [Introduction to Comparative Law], 3rd edn. (Tübingen, J.C.B. Mohr 1996) at p. 23.

⁶ For the question of self-execution see *infra* I.5.3.

⁷ Zweigert and Kötz, *op. cit.* n. 5, at p. 23.

⁸ J.R. Fox, *Dictionary of International and Comparative Law*, 2nd edn. (Dobbs Ferry/New York, Oceana Publications Inc. 1997) at p. 325.

⁹ B.A. Garner et al., eds., *Black's Law Dictionary*, 7th edn. (St. Paul/Minnesota, West Group 1999) at p. 1531).

protection law cannot be regarded as being a typical exponent of uniform law, rather it is a genuine form of international uniform law.

This report consists of two main parts: the first part will deal with seven major international conventions related to the issue of protection and preservation of cultural heritage.¹⁰ It will provide the reader with a comprehensive, up-to-date outline of the most important instruments, illustrating the drafting processes and ideas behind the conventions and summarizing the core regulations important both at the international level and also at the national level in terms of the implementation process. Thus, it will be a good addition to the framework of recently published specific literature on single areas.¹¹

The second part of this report will be an analysis of 16 national legal frameworks in relation to cultural heritage, evaluating—among other things—national concepts in this field, specific national regimes and the impact of the discussed international tools on national laws. It will also point out convergences and divergences in the implementation process among the following countries: Canada, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Mexico, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Spain, Switzerland, Taiwan, Tunisia and the United States.

The 16 contributing countries reflect various, sometimes opposing national approaches. With the exception of Taiwan, which is not recognized as a politically independent country by UNESCO and UNIDROIT and thus is not a state party to any of the conventions outlined in Part I of this report, all contributing countries are involved in the international cultural safeguarding process, with their national legislation influenced by and influencing

¹⁰ See *infra* I.2.: 1954 UNESCO Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict; *infra* I.3.: 1970 UNESCO Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property;

infra I.4.: 1972 UNESCO Convention for the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage;

infra I.5.: 1995 UNIDROIT Convention on Stolen or Illegally Exported Cultural Objects;

infra I.6.: 2001 UNESCO Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage;

infra I.7.: 2003 UNESCO Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage;

infra I.8.: 2005 UNESCO Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions.

I should refer to J. Nafziger and T. Scovazzi, eds., *Le patrimoine culturel de l'humanité/ The Cultural Heritage of Mankind* (Hague Academy of International Law, 2008) (Leiden/ Boston, Martinus Nijhoff 2008) as the most recent and comprehensive work, which covers these international instruments, relevant soft-laws and related issues.

¹¹ F. Francioni and F. Lenzerini, eds., *The 1972 World Heritage Convention—A Commentary* (Oxford, Oxford University Press 2008); J. Blake, *Commentary on the UNESCO 2003 Convention on the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage* (Leicester, Institute of Art and Law 2006); S. Dromgoole, ed., *The Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage: National Perspectives in Light of the UNESCO Convention 2001* 2nd edn. (Leiden, Martinus Nijhoff Publishers 2006).

the international framework. Some countries have been influenced more, others less. The contributing countries represent a balanced mixture of older and newer national cultural heritage legislation. Some are quite active at the international level while others are passive. They also represent various geographical, historic and cultural differences as well as differing overall national concepts and perceptions of cultural heritage protection and the balancing of state and private interests and questions related to indigenous group and community rights.

The realization of this report would not have been possible without the help of a network of people: We would like to thank Steven van Uytsel, Marose Pereira, Margaret Uy and Paulius Jurčys for their research support in drafting this report, Ruben Pauwels, Oliver Galindo, Sean Michael McGinty, Brian Luke Goh and Concetta Frano Grimm for their language assistance, and Robert K. Paterson, Igor Gliha, Tatjana Josipović, Pavel Šturma, Ditlev Tamm, Anne Østrup, Marie Cornu, Kurt Siehr, Federico Lenzerini, Yoshiaki Ishida, Hideto Takagi, Jorge Sánchez Cordero, Ernesto Becerril, Katja Lubina, Paul Myburgh, Sofía de Salas, Eva Maria Belser, Eva Rüegg, Eva Molinari, Ming-Yan Shieh, Chung-Hsi Lee, Monia Ben Jémia, and James A.R. Nafziger for their commitment and invaluable contributions to this general report. We also would like to thank the International Academy of Comparative Law for supporting the idea behind this report. We hope that this report will support the understanding of international and national legal tools in the field of the protection and preservation of cultural heritage and foster its development for the sake of future generations and cultural enjoyment.

Let us now take you on a journey through the history and development of national and international frameworks of cultural heritage protection and preservation law and their future.

Fukuoka, Japan, January 2009

Toshiyuki Kono,
Stefan Wrbka

Note: As far as possible, national and international developments in the field of cultural heritage protection and preservation up and until December 31, 2008 have been taken into account and were incorporated in this report.

Moreover, the authors of the General Report have referred to an English translation of an unpublished French-language version of the Tunisian National Report (written by professor Monia Ben Jémia). However, this Tunisian National Report has not been included in the present volume. This means that the analysis of the national legal frameworks conducted in the General Report is based on 16 National Reports (including the Tunisian one), while the present volume contains the full versions of 15 National Reports.

PART I—INTERNATIONAL LEGAL FRAMEWORK