International Institute for Conservation of Historic and Artistic Works

The ADVOCATE AWARD

Across the world there are those who are deeply committed to the preservation of cultural heritage. These world visionaries may work in museums, government posts, or within the private sector. They may be artists, pioneers in the communications industry, scientists, architects, authors, educators, or entrepreneurs. They may be involved in the arts, the sciences, commerce or politics and policy. What they share is the understanding of the value of heritage to the future and the need to care for that heritage in a sustainable way. IIC acknowledges this support with the Advocate Award, given in recognition of those who use their influence, resources and talents to support the efforts of cultural heritage preservation.

IIC is pleased to present the 2012 Advocate Award to:

Patrick Boylan

Dinu Bumbaru

George MacKenzie

Marie-Thérèse Varlamoff

for their exceptional work to establish and sustain the

International Committee of the Blue Shield (ICBS)

Founded in 1996 to protect the world's cultural heritage threatened by wars and natural disasters, the ICBS has been described as the "Cultural Red Cross". Its name derives from the usage of the blue shield as specified in the 1954 Hague Convention on Protection of Cultural Property in Armed Conflict.

The ICBS consists of representatives from five organizations:

International Council on Archives
International Council of Museums
International Council on Monuments and Sites
International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions
Coordinating Council of Audiovisual Archives Associations

Since the establishment of the Blue Shield, a number of National Blue Shield Committees have been formed in various countries, leading to the December 2008 establishment of the *Association of National Committees of the Blue Shield*.

To celebrate this recognition IIC President Jerry Podany conducted an interview with the four recipients in November and December of 2012. Their comments, discussion and insights regarding the formation of the Committee of the Blue Shield, the efforts to sustain the Blue Shield, and the challenges that remain in the future, form this IIC e-Dialogue, ***Protecting, Preparing and Responding: the International Committee of the Blue Shield***. For additional Dialogues on issues related to disaster preparedness, global climate change and protecting cultural heritage in times of conflict and disaster, please see these other Dialogues: *Rising Tide, Melting Ice: The Preservation of World Archaeological Heritage in Times of Climate Change* (January 2012); *Under Lock and Key? Collection Readiness and Response in Times of Conflict* (February-March 2011); *Before the Unthinkable Happens Again* (July 2009); and *Climate Change and Museum Collections* (September 2008) on the IIC website www.iiconservation.org under the ***Dialogues*** tab.

Protecting, Preparing and Responding

the International Committee of the Blue Shield

an ***IIC e-Dialogue***

with the recipients of IIC 2012 Advocate Award

Patrick Boylan
Dinu Bumbaru
George MacKenzie
Marie-Thérèse Varlamoff

Jerry Podany: Let's start this discussion with a brief outline of how the Blue Shield initiative was created and your recollections of the challenges faced by the four of you in developing the Committee and such a visionary effort.

Patrick Boylan: In many ways the ICBS (International Committee of the Blue Shield) initiative began through serendipity. The 1954 Hague Convention on the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict had been seen as a very innovative measure. It was adopted to basically extend the philosophy of the 1949 Geneva Conventions with the aim of providing measures of response and protection to both cultural property in the way that the Geneva Conventions did for humanitarian protection. The Geneva 1949 and the Hague 1954 convention provided a ground-breaking extension of international law into "non-international" conflicts (like regional conflicts within a State and major civil wars). But after an initial rush of interest (and signing) it was boycotted by most of the major superpowers. In fact we now know that the boycott by the USA, United Kingdom and France was over the nuclear weapons issue: the Americans having been very enthusiastic in 1954 then blocked ratification on the grounds that it might be argued that nuclear weapons were so destructive of cultural property they might be declared illegal under any circumstances. In effect the Hague Convention went into a sort of cold storage, since for something like 23 years the member States never even met. There were attempts by UNESCO in particular to invoke it in some of the conflicts, Cambodia for example, but this was blocked by the superpowers, with disputes over legality of the Vietnamese regime which was invading Cambodia. There were constant battles with UNESCO over attempts to apply Hague 1954 in the various Middle East wars and also Cyprus. It was all a rather unhappy business. I think I'm probably right in saying that it was the late 1980s when we all became increasingly concerned and involved. By 1989, when Yugoslavia started towards conflict, there were around 78 States that had adopted the Hague Convention, but in most cases there was no real commitment or practical application of the Convention, and that didn't really give it major legitimacy, especially since major superpowers like the US and Britain were not parties to it. Then Yugoslavia went into a series of wars: a short one with Slovenia, a long and bloody one with Croatia, and even longer and an worse one between Serbia and Bosnia-Herzegovina. At that point people began to say "Look, something is going seriously wrong with

the international law", especially after the siege and the attacks on the World Heritage city of Dubrovnik on the coast of Croatia. Consequently in early 1992, UNESCO, with financial support from the Dutch government as part of their contribution to the Decade of International Law, decided there had to be some serious discussions as to why the Hague Convention was not working. And that was the point at which I became involved. I had already been leading the monitoring of the situation for the ICOM Executive Council, and in the Autumn of 1992 UNESCO commissioned me, through a research contract with by City University Department, to carry out a 7 to 8 month study of the problems being experienced with the 1954 Convention. The result was a substantial review, quickly published by UNESCO in English and French editions - what became known as the "*Boylan Report*". Both can be downloaded as a full text PDF via. http://tinyurl.com/Boylan-Report-1993 . My report basically said there was nothing wrong with the law itself…the problem was what was wrong with people and their application of the law. The report pointed out the fact that unlike the Geneva Conventions, where there was an important role for the non-governmental side, particularly the Red Cross, there was nothing comparable for the cultural side. As a result the discussions began with that point, particularly between ICA (for archives), IFLA (for libraries), ICOMOS (for monuments and sites) and ICOM (for museums), all of whom were becoming very much concerned with these issues . ICOMOS, for example, had been very concerned with some of the Middle East conflicts. In July 1993 my report was published on the instructions of the UNESCO Executive Board and very widely distributed, going into five or six re-printings of the english edition.

Marie-Thérèse Varlamoff: In 1996, in the framework of its "Memory of the World" program, UNESCO implemented a survey on libraries and archives destroyed in the twentieth century. This survey was conducted in co-operation with IFLA (International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions) and ICA (International Committee on Archives). It was published under the title of "Lost Memory" by Hans van der Hoeven and Joan van Albada. The list of the library and archival collections that had been totally or partially destroyed was appalling.

Some twenty years before, conscious of the extent of the destruction that had affected the world's cultural heritage during World War II, UNESCO had prepared a *Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict*, which was adopted in 1954 in The Hague. The Convention was adopted together with a Protocol which prohibits the export of cultural property from special occupied territory and requires return of such property to the state from which it was removed. The Protocol also expressly forbids the appropriation of cultural property as war reparation.

The State Parties that signed the Convention agreed to adopt preventive measures to protect cultural heritage not only during war time but also during peace time, to protect and respect cultural heritage in case of armed conflicts (even when these are nor international); to create mechanisms to ensure this protection (an international register of cultural items under special protection was created); to indicate with a special sign some important buildings; and to create special units inside the armed forces in charge of the protection of cultural heritage.

It is important to remember that the Blue Shield is the emblem of the 1954Hague Convention and it is used to mark cultural heritage sites so that they will receive the protection offered by the Convention.

George MacKenzie: I came into this admittedly fairly late. I went to work for ICA (International Council on Archives) as the Deputy Secretary General at the beginning of 1995. The first duty I had in that position was to go to Mostar and then to Sarajevo , which at that time was under siege. Clearly there was a steep learning curve both from the standpoint of seeing the effects of armed conflict on cultural property and understanding the deep difficulties this created for our professional colleagues. Having come back from a short time there I then got involved in the discussions that UNESCO was convening to find a way forward. It was at that time, in Paris, that I met Patrick, and I began to understand the power of working together as professionals and as NGOs (non-governmental organizations). I realized that we could do a great deal more if we worked together rather than working independently. That is where the germ of the ICBS (International Committee of the Blue Shield) was born. There was a great deal of recognition that although we were all facing the same problems, cultural property was different, defined differently, in the various professions. Such as in the case of movable or immovable, whether it was on paper or was a collection of artifacts in a museum. But the same issues affected all of us and there was clear evidence that during the Yugoslavian war there had been cases where cultural property was specifically targeted because it was seen as symbolic of one or other of the ethnic groups in the conflict. Having said that, we recognized that we could work together and the emphasis was put on both a practical level, that is to say how we could get cooperation at the ground level in reacting to emergency situations, and what more could be done at the international level to promote the idea of the Blue Shield. The idea, which still exists today, is that the Blue Shield would become as important for cultural property as the Red Cross continues to be for humanitarian concerns. I think we still have a long way to go but it still remains our focus and our goal. I was involved most extensively in 1995 through 1996 while working full time for ICA. It might be worth reminding everyone that the ICBS consists of four main NGOs involved: IFLA (International Federation of Library Associations), ICOMOS (International Council on Monuments and Sites), ICOM (International Council of Museums), and ICA (International Council on Archives).

Dinu Bumbaru: Since we are speaking about the origins of the Blue Shield initiative, it is perhaps fitting to think about a river which comes from many tributaries. There are a number of events, as Patrick, Marie-Thérèse and George have mentioned, that brought this initiative about. One of them can be dated back to 1989 and the fall of the Berlin Wall dividing East and West. We could see with the various political events in Romania and other places that there was increasing concern over the fate of historic landmarks, monuments, and commemorative statuary and so on. There was also a shift of approach to other pressing issues in the balance between the East and the West. The year after the Wall fell there was the first Gulf War. And during this time there were a number of public presentations regarding cultural heritage issues. I might just remind you that the media questioned both General Norman Schwarzkopf and Colin Powell regarding the threat to archaeological sites and how they were addressed in the military strategy and operations in Mesopotamia. That was a moment that raised public concern for cultural heritage and most likely there were a number of discussions at UNESCO at that time. As Patrick mentioned it was the December 1991 bombing of the historic center of Dubrovnik that was a

powerful instigator for concern of cultural heritage. There had been bombings before that, in the summer of 1991, on churches, civic buildings and public landmarks in other parts of Croatia which prefigured the ethnic cleansing of the considerably worse Bosnian phase of the Yugoslavian collapse. In the Dubrovnik incident there were a number of phenomena which happened at the same time. One of them was the fact that a UNESCO Secretariat mission happened to be on site at the time of the bombing. And so there was direct and immediate recording of and communication about the events. It provided a perception of the damage which proved a bit exaggerated in terms of the actual physical damage and devastation. While the numbers were correct, the report gave the impression that as much as 30% of Dubrovnik had been destroyed. However, while 30% of the buildings in the historic center had been hit only a few had suffered total destruction due to shell-induced fire rather than the mortar shells or rockets themselves. Nonetheless that was a tipping point because of the high visibility of Dubrovnik. It's a bit like the fire in the university library at Louvain, Belgium, in the First and Second World Wars. It struck the imagination because it was a highly visited place by Europeans. Inside ICOMOS we were monitoring the situation very closely. In January of 1992 there was a mission to Dubrovnik and I was part of that mission. It was the first time that UNESCO actually sent a mission of experts to an active war zone. They had, of course, sent experts previously, like Jacques Dalibard in Cyprus in the context of the 1973 conflict, but this was during a truce. Or when François LeBlanc went to Lebanon investigating the state of the "immovable" heritage. Dubrovnik was however, the first time experts had been sent by UNESCO to an active war zone to monitor the state of cultural heritage. At the same time Herb Stovel and Leo Van Nispen, Secretary General and Director of Secretariat of ICOMOS, convened a meeting in Paris between ICOMOS, ICOM, UNESCO, ICCROM and other NGOs. It's important to see that the creation of the International Committee of the Blue Shield was an alliance of NGOs in the cultural heritage sector that share the values that exist within the UNESCO family and that was meant to penetrate through all the various barriers. One of the barriers was that archives were not part of the cultural heritage sector in UNESCO. It took a few years to acknowledge situations like these as obstacles. For example, in 1994 ICOMOS carried out a programme review for UNESCO on the issue of risk preparedness which was complementary to the Boylan Report, particularly with reference to how risk preparedness was incorporated in the general topic of cultural heritage conservation. In 1995 in Sri Lanka, there was a meeting of the South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC) on cultural heritage hosted by then president of ICOMOS, Dr. Roland Silva, at which there were leaders from the built heritage, archaeology, museum and archives sectors. It was quite an enlightening discussion and it resulted in ICOMOS, as the convener of an inter-agency task force set up with UNESCO after the Dubrovnik bombing, inviting ICA's Secretary General Charles Keskemeti at the 1996 meeting which George and Marie-Thérèse also attended. At this meeting the idea of closing the circle appeared. The four organizations realized that they had a common interest in this matter and that a common declaration could be the impetus to move forward. UNESCO, within the international standard section, was interested in having an NGO voice on the subject, so they supported the idea. In 1996 the International Committee of the Blue Shield (ICBS) was formed and its terms of agreement, inspired by the structure of the International Red Cross, of which Leo Van Nispen had been a Director of the Netherlands Committee, drafted by a small group including George, Patrick and myself on my laptop at a desk in the ICOM offices at UNESCO Miollis. The ICBS's also expressed interest in collaboration within the cultural sector beyond what the structure of UNESCO allowed. We wanted to expand. In these

meetings there were people from the UN World Meteorological Organisation (WMO) and we realized that while war is a serious issue, the world also has earthquakes, hurricanes, typhoons, floods and a wide range of natural and man-made disasters including industrial accidents. And although climate change was not on the agenda at the time, it has since become an observable fact that now has to be addressed. My point is that these sources of the creation of the ICBS are numerous and an ecosystem of ongoing discussion quickly developed. One organization that should not be forgotten is ICCROM, which was very much supportive, as well as UNESCO's World Heritage Centre.

George MacKenzie: One of the strengths of the initiative of the Blue Shield is that although it is principally oriented toward the protection of cultural property in the event of armed conflict it does have an important role in mitigating and managing disasters derived from natural and man-made causes other than armed conflict. I think that's one of the aspects that makes it a truly international initiative and of universal appeal, even in stable countries where armed conflict is not likely. In moments of natural disaster the same need for cooperation exists and such cooperation results in the same benefits.

Patrick Boylan: I think in these early stages we all became aware that the political barriers were extremely strong and that we were more likely to make progress through the NGOs. ICCROM, for example, as an intergovernmental rather than non-governmental organization, had quite serious problems. We had a joint meeting of ICOM and ICOMOS in Ferrara at the time of the attacks in Yugoslavia, but when ICOM delegates put a proposal forward for a rather mild resolution about this, the ICCROM delegation had to leave the room because as an intergovernmental body the delegates felt that they couldn't speak and certainly couldn't vote, without first consulting their governments. That was one of the things that made us think we had to find another way to move more quickly. Following on from that the General Conference of ICOM held a major discussion in Stavanger (Norway) in the summer of 1995, about what was going on in Sarajevo and ICOM passed a resolution calling for greater action and cooperation. The next opportunity, as George mentioned, was in June of 1996 at the ICOM offices where he drafted an agreement to establish the International Committee of the Blue Shield. It was signed on the spot by the four of us, and we began to organize our NGOs. The other thing that George did was to get funding from the communications side of UNESCO, which covers libraries and archives, for the very important meeting in Radenci and Maribor, Slovenia. There, for the first time, we actually had both coordination among our own organizations as well as more widely. And training opportunities were developed. I think more than anything else that meeting convinced me of the importance of the initiative and we began to realize that if you had a major disaster affecting a museum or library you desperately needed the expertise of the ICOMOS people, otherwise the borough engineer or the government official would come and demolish the historic building for safety reasons. Even more importantly there are often similar conservation resources in the same town as the disaster, though in different departments and different ministries. And if you have a major disaster you need to get those working together.

And finally I remember the opening reception of the Radenci meeting on the Slovenia-Austria border. During this I introduced two very senior book and archive conservators to each other. One worked in the archives and the other worked it the libraries. Both had big teams and expertise in dealing with

damaged paper and conservation problems related to paper and similar materials. They both worked in the same country, they both worked in the same ministry, they worked at opposite ends of the same government building, in the national capital and they had been working there respectively for about 25 and 21 years. And yet they had never met one other! From a conservation standpoint we were able to hammer away the point that if you have a threat or an actual disaster you need to look to the whole of the conservation and cultural heritage family for support. You cannot be doing what tended to happen, which was if you have a disaster like a flood somewhere you wait for someone to come and fix it all from the national capital. When in fact there might be the expertise 300 m away but coming from different governmental or ministerial departments.

JP: No doubt there were a great many challenges faced in developing and sustaining the Blue Shield initiative. I would like each of you to describe the greatest challenges and to say what which of those you think still exist…or describe new challenges that have appeared on the horizon.

Marie-Thérèse Varlamoff: As was said before the major challenge was to represent an unrivalled body of expertise to advise and assist in responding to events such as wars or internal conflicts and to provide authorities and professionals with expertise and networks in the case of armed conflicts as well as natural disasters that could affect cultural heritage throughout the world. The four organizations that created this international, independent, co-operative venture in 1996 were referred to as the International Committee of the Blue Shield and are now also working together to organize risk preparedness at an international level and to encourage it at a local level.

The main objectives of ICBS were, and still are, to facilitate international response to threats or emergencies through co-operation between ICBS and national organizations; to propose its services in terms of expertise; to encourage safeguarding and respect for cultural property; to promote standards for risk preparedness; and to train experts at a national or regional level to prevent, control and recover from disasters. Raising public awareness about damage to cultural heritage, implementing programs for preventing and managing disaster and for rebuilding afterwards, and identifying resources for prevention and rapid intervention in emergency situations remain among our main challenges for the future. The vision of the ICBS is that in time the Blue Shield will become for cultural heritage what the Red Cross is for humanitarian protection. During a meeting in Strasbourg (France), April 2000, where Patrick, George, and myself were present, we elaborated the ICBS Charter and decided to respect the following principles: joint actions, independence, neutrality, professionalism, respect of cultural identity and maintaining a non-profit basis. These principles were derived from those of the Red Cross.

The international seminar organized in November 1998 in Radenci (Slovenia) to train professional staff to intervene following disasters, gathered participants from 12 countries. These colleagues were drawn from museums, archives, libraries and historic building programs. They spent a week discussing strategies and tactics for dealing with disasters. Case studies on war damage in Bosnia and Croatia, flood damage in Poland, earthquakes in Italy, together with the experiences of Dutch and Swedish military personal, including a former UN commander in Bosnia, provided the raw material for the seminar. At the end a joint statement was drafted and became known as the *Radenci Declaration.* It called for the

protection, safeguarding and respect of cultural property in both normal and exceptional situations and that this was to be included in national policies and programs. The Declaration recommended the development of strategies to assess and reduce risk as well as to develop response capacity in the event of threats to cultural property. It recommended that institutions caring for cultural heritage should integrate risk preparedness and management in their activities.

Since its creation it has been obvious that the efficiency of ICBS would be enhanced by the creation of national Blue Shield Committees. It is vital for the international initiative to be taken up and supported by local initiatives. National Blue Shield Committees have been and are being formed in a number of countries. In France, the National Committee created in 2001 has advocated for the creation of local committees. These are now very active. The French Committee organizes yearly seminars to raise awareness of disasters. Up to now around the world, 20 National Blue Shield Committees have been registered, and 25 are in planning stages.

In 2008, an Association of National Committees of the Blue Shield (ANCBS) was created which can be described as the executive force of the Blue Shield. Its President, Karl von Habsburg, recently went on a mission to Lybia and Egypt in order to assess and report on the damage which occurred during the events of last year in the Arab countries.

Dinu Bumbaru: I think the biggest challenge was to resist the temptation of adding yet another layer of administration and bureaucracy. I think we are still facing that challenge because originally the Blue Shield initiative was imagined as a cooperative framework for existing organizations. Gradually there has been a momentum to install it as a separate organization and that may create some confusion, ending up in dispersing energy in structure rather than mobilizing it for conservation and preparedness action. Instead of enabling an evolution of the internal cultural organization, I am speaking for ICOMOS, we instead had, in those years, a significant discussion on the issue of authenticity. People in ICOMOS were observing that we were investing an incredible amount of energy and effort on debating and discussing an initiative to address an issue that was more curatorial then preventive in nature. The shift of paradigm in those years was really trying to introduce the notion of prevention that existed in other sectors. We were trying to be a bit more aware and sophisticated in that matter. Creating a separate organization has focused energy on structural development rather than cultural evolution. Were trying to catch up all these years later. ICOMOS has started to develop internal discussions on preparedness, prevention and so on. And it is now trying to disseminate this in its own ecosystem where we have institutions and individual members, non-for profit, governmental or municipal members, and members from the private sector. This is an important challenge. A bit like George mentioned, I have personally been following the Blue Shield from some distance in the last few years. One of the original challenges which I think we managed to address was how can we engage the partners. The fact that the Secretary Generals, or the heads of each organization, actually met about the Blue Shield and that the Blue Shield coordination has been established at such a high level, was, in my opinion, very real success.

George MacKenzie: I agree fully with Dinu. Internationally there was a challenge to get the NGOs together, however that was actually achieved swiftly and smoothly. It allowed the international

committee to have meetings very early on. The additional challenge was, and still is, how to transfer that international cooperation down to regional, national and sub-national levels across the world. How do we convince colleagues working in their own institutions and countries that this is a valid and important initiative? I think that sometimes we are a bit like ambulance chasers, pursuing examples of where collaboration is valuable and can lead to a better result. I don't think it's too cynical or damaging to do that. When there are disasters, earthquakes and damage such as in Haiti, a discussion of collaboration is important. For example at the Cologne Archives, when the building collapsed into a new tramway tunnel, the response generated a huge amount of national and international cooperation. We have to learn from these examples, and then move forward. The real value comes when you can transfer the international cooperation to a national and sub-national level and get direct cooperation. But for the ordinary archivist and for the archives conservator, the Blue Shield will be something they may have heard about but they don't fully understand it. The kind of communication that Patrick mentioned and that happened at Radici, the conservator from the library and the conservator from the archives coming together, doing that is really the challenge. It is a matter of how can we multiply that again and again across the world.

Patrick Boylan: I agree very much with what Dino and George have said. As Marie-Thérèse has said the model we looked at was the international Red Cross. I can't remember the exact figure but the actual ICRC (International Committee of the Red Cross) consists of, I think, less than ten people, all of them based in Geneva. Our idea was that since three of the four organizations had their headquarters and executive head in Paris and the fourth, IFLA, had their senior conservation head in Paris, the ICBS would itself be a virtual organization of the four heads of the organizations. They would be able to seek and coordinate resources from their own members within hours rather than months to deal with issues. Of course since then it has become considerably easier to provide resources. There is certainly a significant improvement in the ease of communication. The idea then was that the tentacles would go out from this core organization, through the network of the four world NGOs, and would provide immediate resources. For this we strongly encouraged cooperation at the national level – through national Blue Shield committees, again following the Red Cross model. One of the troubles has been to get the commitment of support and the recognition of the ICBS among national governments and the military. But I think at the moment the ICBS is doing quite well and has taken very positive steps forward. The head for the current period is Julien Anfruns, who has wide international and government-based experience and is now the Director General of ICOM. I think the Federation is working quite well with the ICBS for the future. It's been a slow start and we have had periods of difficulty, but I think we're moving forward quite productively now, particularly with Karl von Habsburg-Lothringen, as President of the Federation. Still one of the big bottlenecks remains: UNESCO is grossly understaffed in the area of cultural protection.

I should mention that we had only one really major loss at the Diplomatic Conference in March 1999, which drew up and adopted the Second Protocol to the Hague Convention, building on the 'Boylan Report', and much follow-up work. A very strong case was presented by Blue Shield, which was supported by the Red Cross, to grant formal recognition and protection in conflict and other emergency situations to officially recognized cultural protection workers. This was parallel to that of Red Cross and

other humanitarian workers under the 1949 Geneva Conventions. This was not accepted by some of the States represented, and as the Diplomatic Conference sought to make decisions only by consensus, it did not pass. I assume that the military advisers in particular do want civilians moving around in a battle zone and I must say I understand that. I am more and more convinced that however good it might be to go into the actual conflict it ultimately remains impractical and what we really have to do is to concentrate on trying to get the military itself to provide adequate support in the field, as has happened in a number of cases. The Blue Shield therefore plays a very important role in the pre-conflict preparation and post conflict recovery phases.

JP: I do hope IIC's recognition of the Blue Shield and the posting of this dialogue will help clarify the larger role of the initiative. By that I mean the recognition of the role ICBS plays as a resource in times of natural or man-made disasters. I want to ask each of you if you feel optimistic or not about the future success of the Blue Shield initiative to protect cultural heritage, particularly in times of conflict?

Patrick Boylan: This is an area in which I have been researching and teaching for the last 15 years or more and I have to say I'm rather pessimistic. Not because of anything lacking in our field but because in so many places things are becoming so polarized. So many in the field have worked hard and have been successful at communicating the message that cultural heritage is a fundamentally important symbol of national identity. But the first thing that happened when a single tank went into one of the squares of a Croatian historic city was that, in broad daylight with no one shooting at them, they aimed their gun and put 11 shells into the 6 buildings that were marked by the Blue Shield symbol. Why? They did this because they wanted to eliminate the identity of the "other side". One is horrified by the degree and results of so much partisan conflict and hatred in so many places around the world. And we must remember all of the internal conflicts in other parts of the world at the present time, most notably lately in parts of Africa, Mali for example. I think we have to change hearts and minds and go back to the opening statement of the UNESCO Charter, taken from the opening statement by the British Prime Minister at an opening Congress in London: "Since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defenses of peace must be constructed".

We must also keep in mind and communicate the importance of understanding that there is nothing that can't happen in times of conflict, save perhaps a nuclear holocaust, that could not also happen in a natural or man-made disaster. Therefore it is very important that one creates an overall approach of cooperation and planning for such events. I made this point in a key note address at a joint ICOM-Indian Government congress in Hyderabad (India), at the end of 2003. I was emphasizing the need to balance our attention between those things that are low risk but very frequent and those incidents which are rare but massively destructive. I closed by pointing out that the Indian Ocean was subject to really quite serious tsunami risks which none of the government offices or officials were taking into account. The Indian government did take notice of this comment however and went to the Asian summit countries three or four months later to propose that the Asian countries join the Pacific-Asian tsunami watch. Unfortunately all the other heads of the governments turned down the proposal, saying they do not face the risk of tsunami. And then the 26th December 2004 came along with massive loss of life because of the lack of preparation and adequate warning. I'm not claiming to be a prophet. This was simply a

matter of fact or an attempt to face facts. So I think the message of the Blue Shield initiative is that you have to look at all risks. I'm particularly concerned about massive hazards that are infrequent because people forget about them and are unlikely to take measures to mitigate risk.

George MacKenzie: I agree with a lot of what Patrick has said, but I'm naturally optimistic. And yet I think it would be foolish to think that the sources of conflict are going to disappear. I think that what the Blue Shield initiative can continue to do is to sensitize people in advance of conflict about the potential dangers that may occur and help them to prepare so that they will be ready to take mitigating measures. This can only a good thing. We will never be able to design a "scientific experiment" proving or disproving the benefits of preparedness, where we can compare the results of doing nothing with being prepared. But I think my natural optimism suggests that doing something ahead of time is worthwhile. I think more cooperation, more knowledge and more communication among colleagues is inevitably going to be a good thing. Something else that emerged out of the Blue Shield was a better understanding of military thinking. Two things occurred to me: the emergency workshop and conference that we had with people from the Netherlands military, who were very helpful in contributing their knowledge of how commanders would operate in times of conflict. And I know Patrick has done some work with the US military and brought some very knowledgeable people to address this issue. We also held some workshops in London, which Patrick hosted at the City University, where we brought people from the archives and the UK military together. That discussion was both informative and inspiring. I believe it was there that the issue of whether we should mark buildings with the Blue Shield or not was debated. Our colleagues from Bosnia gave examples of buildings that were targeted because they had the symbol on them. But we concluded after the discussion that the Red Cross is occasionally fired upon in armed conflict as well, but that doesn't stop the use of the symbol. If we believe in the initiative, and we do, we need to go on using the symbol and the markings even if from time to time marked buildings are fired upon. These sorts of relationships, which the ICBS can make happen in times of peace, can help us to prepare for the times of conflict. I would end by saying that my natural optimism helps me believe we are making progress. But I do not in any way belittle the size of the challenge in front of us.

Patrick Boylan: Yes I agree. And I too am basically optimistic about the future. One thing you did not mention George, is that right at the beginning you managed to persuade the former Swedish NATO Commander in Yugoslavia, General Wahlgren, later the military Assistant Secretary-General of the UN, of the value of our Blue Shield project. He was a most valuable participant in the first Blue Shield Workshop that you organized for us in Slovenia. In the end I think we learned a great deal from the military colleagues who have attended Blue Shield meetings and other sessions and they also learned a good deal from us. Quite a number have taken important roles in the setting up and running of National Blue Shield Committees.

Marie-Thérèse Varlamoff: I am sorry to confess that I feel rather pessimistic. First of all ICBS will never get nations to stop fighting and most of all cultural heritage will always remain a target to be destroyed in times of war. Second, even when awareness is raised on the importance of safeguarding cultural heritage for future generations, it remains difficult to make armed forces understand the

universality of cultural heritage. It is essential that armed forces be instructed beforehand of the value of cultural heritage in the countries where they are operating. They should also receive instructions on ways to protect cultural heritage from damage due to military activities. Nevertheless my pessimism is tempered by the fact that all actions taken against damage in times of war are generally adaptable to natural disasters and allow for the mitigation of the terrible effects of a disaster.

I am also pessimistic about the fact that in order to be really efficient ICBS and ANCBS, as well as National Committees, must have substantial funding, which is not the case right now. That makes it very difficult to organize any kind of activity and above all to establish a necessary full time secretariat with a permanent staff.

An important problem remains. Each of the founding organizations (IFLA, ICA, ICOM, ICOMOS) has established its own risk preparedness program which more or less duplicates the action of ICBS. This makes it difficult to know who decides, ICBS or one of the organizations, what actions to be taken.

Dinu Bumbaru: I recall a casual conversation I had some years ago with the President of ICOMOS, Michael Petzet. While discussing this and the development of risk-sensitive conservation and management for heritage, we noted with some irony, that ultimately in 100 million years all of this will be gone anyway…all our efforts will have been in vain. Yet we concluded that our cause is just and we need to pursue it. We are part of what makes humans…human. We contribute toward what makes the human species unique. It is not a matter of being optimistic or pessimistic. For thousands of years people have been doing horrible things to each other and as a result we can be very negative about the human species. But I feel we can contribute to improvement. And we have done so. The Blue Shield, although it may be just a drop in a vast ocean of challenges, is a great achievement. Even the Great Wall of China was made one brick that time and laying each brick may have been seen as a futile and vain act in comparision to such an immense task. But in the end, something wonderful and grand was achieved. I feel that we may not be able to change the war prone attitude of nations and people immediately. We see what is happening in Syria, where the belligerents have decided that Aleppo, one of the great ancient cities in the world, one of the beacons of civilization, has been chosen as the battleground for this bloody civil war. I'm not sure we can immediately do anything about this. And this is tragic. But beyond these individual moments of sadness we are able to contribute to something positive. Some of the large military bodies in the world care more now and pay more attention to what they do about cultural heritage and feel some accountability. 25 years ago most didn't care at all. This is a small but real sign of progress. Of course, it remains a challenge since armed conflict is ever evolving. My perspective is looking at how we can make a community evolve – a community such as the people of a country but also the heritage community itself. We have George and Marie-Thérèse who are part of an institutional governmental structure, Patrick coming from the academic and university side and former conservation director within large museum, library and archive services, and I come to this ICBS through the gateway of local advocacy organizations and citizens group. Just having these three worlds – public sector, academia, citizen associations – talking to each other over the common cause is a great source of inspiration. We may not be able to change humanity at once, but if we can continue the dialogue we might be able to increase people's awareness of the consequences of conflict and lack of preparedness.

In that sense I think we are making of very valuable contribution. And we must persevere at this. One of the great challenges for cultural heritage in the 21st-century will not be restoration or authenticity. Rather it will be about the value, meaning and protection of heritage…within an environment of conflict and recovery.

Patrick Boylan: I am basically optimistic about the future. From a museum heritage conservation perspective I think the most important developments of recent decades have been the creation of ICOM's first Code of Ethics in 1986, the establishment of Blue Shield in 2006, and the adoption of the Second Protocol to the Hague Convention in 1999. I feel very fortunate to have been so closely involved in all three of these efforts.

JP: Dinu, you included three keywords that are important to my last question: advocacy, awareness, and value. Isn't much of what the four of you have been talking about focused and dependent upon helping people around the world become more aware of the value of cultural heritage? The preservation of cultural heritage remains so important to maintaining variety in our world. It gives substance to our past and direction to our future. What would be your advice to members of the conservation community, both the community's organizations and its individuals, as to how they can help to raise awareness of the value of cultural heritage?

Dinu Bumbaru: I would suggest that they speak out. We have been developing a trend to speak out after disasters. But I think there is a case to be made for building a voice for heritage in an ongoing way, not just in times of disasters or conflict. This is going on locally. We know that the World Heritage Convention tries to do this for example. In French we say "*Connaître + Reconnaître + Faire connaître = Protéger*" (knowledge, acknowledgment and awareness brings protection). Would it not be helpful if we were to create and update a map of the world where there is a voice for heritage and feed it to the news media, to bring cultural heritage to a permanent seat at the table of the world community? When we organized a debriefing exercise after the Kobe earthquake in Japan in 1997, we were in Tokyo and got lost with some colleagues in the Tokyo Metropolitan Government building. We ended up in what seemed to be a "control room", like the NASA control room, with all sorts of giant screens around us. It turned out to be the emergency disaster headquarters for Tokyo. People explained to us who had seats around the main table. The names of represented organizations were actually carved into the table. And I noticed that there was nothing for cultural heritage. Not for historic buildings, not for museums, not for archives, not for libraries at the table….nothing. At that point I realized that this was a major challenge for us in the heritage sector. Being part of that circle was something that had to be achieved. This is a possible pursuit. I'm glad to say that just in 2012 Japan's Prime Minister Office and Cabinet Secretariat decided to create an experts committee to examine heritage aspects of operating industrial sites, an example of how heritage can catch attention of high level decision makers. This starts to connect the various worlds. It's a challenge, but I think we can achieve a forward-looking voice for heritage preservation in the world communities.

George MacKenzie: This is an interesting question you have asked, Jerry. I have three specific thoughts: First, taking up on what Dinu has just said, I think that by bringing together all the different

organizations involved in cultural heritage we can achieve a great deal more than we can working separately. I think the ICBS is an indication of that and perhaps a blueprint for the future. My second thought has to do with the phrase "cultural diplomacy". It's used quite a lot in Scotland lately in relationship to using the shared cultural heritage that we have and the connections that Scotland has had with countries across the world. There is a political dimension to this of course. But I believe that the concept can be quite helpful in preservation as well. It shows the importance of heritage objects and sites. All of these are in fact evidence of the past and our position in it, and of the connections we and our predecessors have to the world. Remembering that is important and valuable. And finally , I think one of the best ways of raising awareness about heritage issues is to depict them in stories…things that actually relate to real people. The public is potentially interested in old things, but what really grabs their attention are the stories and any direct relationships the objects might have to them and their lives. I think we've got a lot to learn from the way the media and the press communicates. Although perhaps not always fully accurate…the way they tell stories is instructive. Bringing home the importance of cultural property to a wider public is an essential part of what we hope for. The more we can do to tell stories and relate our work to peoples' lives, the better.

Patrick Boylan: My experience of over 40 years informs me that conservators are changing. They are developing new attitudes and approaches. They are getting out of their laboratories and not just looking down the microscope, but looking far more broadly at the social and educational role of the heritage sector. Conservators need to continue to broaden this awareness of the wider context of what they're doing. Over my working lifetime conservators have advanced into being actively involved in giving advice about exhibitions and especially preventive care. This is a very positive step. But of course we still have battles ahead of us in terms of the status of conservators and conservation professionals in many countries around the world. Conservators need to be more directly involved in the broader issues of preservation. Their voice needs to be heard. And this voice does not necessarily always need to be about the technical aspects of conservation but should address the broader issues. Communicating to the broader world what the challenges are and how they are being met in conservation and preservation is extraordinarily important. And we should never forget just how much was saved despite times of conflict. For example just how much of the collections and built heritage were saved during World War II simply because of the close analysis of the experience of modern warfare during the Spanish Civil War. Much of this was done by the International Museums Office of The League of Nations which covered archives and monuments at that time, and which was in many ways ICOM's predecessor. It was interesting and encouraging for example to see how much cultural property was saved in Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina using wartime protection techniques that were developed during the Spanish Civil War and promoted afterwards by the International Museums Office and then by UNESCO.

For four years I was privileged to be the head of the joint conservation project covering all of the learned societies in Burlington House in London including the Royal Academy, the Geological Society, the Linnean Society, and the Society of Antiquaries. This project was primarily related to books and manuscripts and some works of art on paper. Of course with such marvelous scientific and artistic collections, the conservators understandably wanted to concentrate on advanced scientific treatment and research on this wonderful and exciting material. We came to an informal agreement however that

they would have time allocated for such especially rewarding (and expensive) work on individual items, but that mostly the time needed to be spent on establishing basic care procedures for the many thousands of items in the collections. Basic cleaning, organization, proper storage and handling arrangements were the real priority. It is important to balance these equally important approaches in the work of the conservator. Such maintenance and preventive conservation is not necessarily best left to technicians but rather it should be seen as part of the work of the expert conservators. And I think conservators and their profession have made great progress in these directions already and will continue to do so in the future.

Marie-Thérèse Varlamoff: Communicate, communicate, communicate, this is the word. Using all possible media: conferences, the press, television etc. It is essential that people be aware that Culture is an intermingling of archives, libraries, museums, monuments and many other items that are indispensable to build our future and that this cultural heritage has to be preserved as a priority.

JP: This has been a most informative and thought provoking discussion. I want to thank all four of you for this dialogue and for your work in establishing and sustaining the ICBS. And thank you as well for your advocacy on behalf of cultural heritage preservation. Congratulations for the well deserved award. It may well be the case that human conflict will always be with us, certainly natural disasters will continue to threaten and challenge us. But in the face of these unfortunate scenarios the four of you have shown that we can act, in cooperation, to mitigate the risk, reduce the loss and assure the long term survival of our cultural treasures, expressions of creativity and symbols of identity. I am especially grateful for your words of advice and encouragement to the conservation profession. Communication is indeed the tool we must take up and the path we must go down. Fortunately for all of us that path has been paved by your work and impressive success.

Patrick Boylan: has been the director of major local authority arts, museums, heritage and archive services in Exeter, Leicester and Leicestershire for almost 23 years before joining City University in 1990, where he was Head of Department for five years, and at various times directed the MAs in Arts Management, Arts Management in Education, and in Museum and Gallery Management. Awarded the title of Professor Emeritus upon his retirement in 2004, he remains closely associated with the Department as a research degree supervisor, researcher and guest lecturer. He served three terms on the Association's governing Council, and was its Centenary President for 1988-90. Internationally he has held a wide range of offices in the UNESCO-based International Council of Museums (ICOM), including two terms as Chairperson of the International Committee for the Training of Personnel (1986 – 1992 and 1997 – 2003), Chairperson of the Ethics Committee (1984 – 1990), Vice-President (1992 – 1998), and most recently Chairperson of the Legal Affairs Committee (2004 -2008). Patrick Boylan has been recognised as a leading international authority on cultural policy, professional training, and the protection of the heritage in times of armed conflict (for which the Republic of Croatia awarded him the country's "Danica" High Order of Merit),and he was one of the four signatories, on behalf of ICOM, of the July 1996 agreement to establish the ICBS.

Dinu Bumbaru: Is a graduate in architecture and conservation from Université de Montréal, ICCROM and the University of York (UK) where he studied emergency response for heritage sites, drawing from his participation in the UNESCO expert mission to the besieged World Heritage site of Dubrovnik in January 1992. Since 1982, he has worked at Héritage Montréal, a not-for-profit organisation aimed at protecting, promoting and revitalising the diverse built, landscape, memorial, archaeological and natural heritage of Montreal and the greater metropolitan area. In that capacity, he has contributed to connecting heritage conservation and citizen participation with urban, environmental and cultural development processes and policies. Within the NGO sector, Dinu connects local action and global inspiration and solidarity through his volunteer involvement in ICOMOS which is the non-governmental Advisory Body to UNESCO and the World Heritage Committee. Currently President of ICOMOS Canada and a member of the International Executive Committee, he was Secretary General of the whole organisation between 2002 and 2008. His main professional interests are in the fields of risk preparedness and disaster reduction, the heritage of the modern age, and the metropolis, as well as in the fast-evolving relation between citizens, communities and the ethos and practice of conservation. His many contributions to the conservation of heritage locally and globally, as well as to the development of education and public participation processes, earned Dinu Bumbaru the Médaille de la Chaire, UNESCO of Université Laval in 2004; the appointment to the Order of Canada in 2008; and the Prix du Québec en Patrimoine in 2012.

George McKenzie: From January 2002 to his retirement in October 2012, George MacKenzie was Keeper of the Records of Scotland. He was also Registrar General for Scotland and chief executive of National Records of Scotland (NRS) from August 2011. The group has responsibility for the nation's archives and records, the registration of vital events, the decennial census and compiling demographic statistics. He is a member of the Programme Commission of the International Council on Archives (ICA), and was responsible for ICA's projects on electronic records and archive automation, 2004-8. He worked as Deputy Secretary General of ICA in Paris, and carried out missions to Bosnia and Herzegovina for UNESCO, 1995-7, advising on the protection of archives in armed conflict. He was appointed a Fellow of ICA in September 2012. He has consulted for ICA, UNESCO, the World Bank and the government of Abu Dhabi, specialising in archive preservation and electronic networking. He has also been external examiner for postgraduate archives and records management students at the universities of Liverpool and Aberystwyth in the United Kingdom. In November 2012 George McKenzie became a trustee of the International Records Management Trust, based in London.

Marie-Thérèse Varlamoff served as Librarian for the National French Library from 1968-2006 (retiring in March 2006). She was the Director of IFLA Preservation and Conservation Core Activity from 1995 to 2006 and a founding member (2001) and Vice-President of the French Committee of the Blue Shield (2001-2012). She served as a member of the UNESCO "Memory of the World", 1995-2005, and was Director of *International Preservation News,* 1995-2006. Marie-Thérèse Varlamoff has authored numerous articles on preservation and on the Blue Shield and has actively participated in conferences, seminars and workshops in more than 45 countries, particularly in Latin America, Asia and Africa.