PalArch's Journal of Archaeology of Egypt / Egyptology

CHALLENGES OF ENVIRONMENTAL GOVERNANCE FOR PROTECTION OF WORLD CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE SITES

Hafiz Muhammad Naseer[1], Kanwar Muhammad Javed Iqbal[2], Muhammad Irfan Khan[3]

[1,2,3] Department of Environmental Science, International Islamic University, Islamabad,

Pakistan

[2]National Institute of Maritime Affairs, Bahria University, Islamabad, Pakistan

Email: [1]mnaseer@iiu.edu.pk

ABSTRACT

Governance for protection of environment, cultural and natural heritage got attention after World Heritage Convention followed by World Heritage Programme of UNESCO. The convention of protection of cultural and natural heritage requires states parties should review and reinforce governance frameworks within management systems of World Heritage properties. The protection of world cultural and natural heritage is also provided under environmental protection laws worldwide including Pakistan, which forms a nexus between environmental governance and heritage governance. In the context, this qualitative research paper aimed to analyze the state of knowledge about environmental governance of heritage sites by reviewing the global dynamics and the case of Pakistan. It attempts to explain the important aspect of governance for the protection of environment and the cultural and natural heritage considering the case of Pakistan, where environmental protection laws of two sub-national units cover such sites and other do not even, where UNESCO Heritage sites are located. It has identified that the case of Pakistan became critical after the 18th amendment in national constitution of Pakistan.

INTRODUCTION

The natural catastrophes waves the environment including all types of generally built and particularly the heritage sites which are culturally cherished by communities and represented as their historical achievements (Spennemann & Graham, 2007). Although these damages are inevitable but

the detrimental impacts can be mitigated if the community takes appropriate actions at right time (Stone, 2015). There are several gaps revealed by state of the art research of modern world in the regulatory institutions particularly in social field as to govern the global scale challenges (Kotzé, 2020). The fast changing worldwide characteristic need necessary adaptive governance which should be operationalized with a consideration of environment and heritage together because of mutual linkage and co-evolutionary interdependence of social and ecological systems based on feedback(Phillips, 2015).

Following themes of environment and environmental governance after the 'World Heritage Programmed' of UNESCO, the topic of heritage got attention of academia and has become a fashion too. But, it is a bitter fact that the World Heritage Governance at global level has not been studied in terms of social aspects which can be presented as global cultural governance (Kreft & Eckstein, 2013). However, the environmental governance instruments and structures also change from time to time and may affect the efforts for protection of world cultural and natural heritage sites. The World Heritage Convention for Protection of World Cultural and Natural Heritage was adopted by the UN General Assembly on 16 November 1972. UNESCO adopted a policy for the integration of a sustainable development perspective into the processes of the World Heritage Convention, during the General Assembly of States Parties to the World Heritage Convention at its 20th session. This policy requires that States Parties to convention should review and reinforce governance frameworks within management systems of World Heritage properties in order to achieve the appropriate balance, integration and harmonization between the protection of outstanding universal values (OUV) and the pursuit of sustainable development objectives. The World Heritage Convention in Article 5 calls upon States Parties to "adopt a general policy which aims to give the cultural and natural heritage a function in the life of the community". States Parties should recognize that inclusive social development is at the heart of the implementation of this provision of the Convention. States Parties should further recognize that full inclusion, respect and equity of all stakeholders, including local and concerned communities and indigenous peoples, together with a commitment to gender equality, are fundamental premise for inclusive social development. Enhancing quality of life and well-being in and around World Heritage properties is essential, taking into account the communities who might not visit or reside in or near properties but are still stakeholders (Parthesius, 2011).

Inclusive governance must underpin a comprehensive social development. It needs to be coherent with UN's sustainable development agenda as enshrined in the document "Transforming Our World: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development", existing international humanitarian standards and other multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs). States Parties should ensure an appropriate and equitable balance between conservation, sustainability and development, so that World Heritage properties can be protected through appropriate activities contributing to the social and economic development and the quality of life of our communities.

The institutional dimensions of environmental governance are although easy to understand but yet not easy to understand the role of national and sub-national institutions in protection of cultural and natural heritage sites (Young, 2008). The foreign policy of a nation also does not ignore the perspective of its culture and heritage (Leshikar-Denton, 2010). In the modern world, there are no exceptions of being affected by the dreadful waves of global influential forces. The culture and heritage aspire the aesthetics and affections of the nation and the cultural communication works across the globe between the relationships of the different countries (AtKisson, 2009). Despite other perspectives the need of cultural exchanges among the nations has been much increased (Manglis et al., 2021).

In the context, this article reviews, analyze and tries to explain the important aspect of governance for the protection of environment and the cultural and natural heritage considering the case of Pakistan, where environmental protection laws of two sub-national units cover such sites and other do not even, where UNESCO Heritage sites are located.

METHODOLOGY
Primarily, this is a qualitative research paper aimed at analyzing the state of knowledge about environmental governance of heritage sites by reviewing the global dynamics and the case of Pakistan through scrutinizing the stock of existing literature. An interpretative approach with content analysis technique was adopted for the purpose of this study (Crowther & Lancaster, 2012) that enabled to explore and examine the earlier studies on heritage governance (Conejos et al., 2016). The leading phase of investigation was to build an academic discourse based on the progression of the concept on heritage, governance arrangements and functional aspects. The preliminary level of study was brought up on exploratory research strategy (Yin, 2015). For developing case study of Pakistan and the global dynamics, the situational analysis technique (Hassan et al., 2014) was employed (Śladowski & Paruch, 2017) to decipher about the state of affairs regarding the prerequisites of the environmental governance (Klein & Müller, 2012; Morkūnaitė et al., 2019).

ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION
In south Asian region, the legislation has been initiated on different issues of environmental management concerns including conservation of heritage (Khayam & Ahmad, 2020). The state of knowledge about environmental governance of heritage sites was analyzed by reviewing the global dynamics and the case of Pakistan through scrutinizing the stock of existing literature. Pakistan became party to UN Convention for protection of cultural and natural heritage sites by ratification of the convention on 23 July 1976, making its historical sites eligible for inclusion on the list. Since then, UNESCO has designated six sites in Pakistan as World Heritage Sites and twenty-six sites are on the tentative list. All these heritage sites are located in provinces. The protection of world cultural and natural heritage is also provided under environmental protection laws, worldwide. The section 31 of Pakistan Environmental Protection Act of 1997 provides powers to Federal Government to make rules for implementation of international environmental agreements included in the Schedule of the Pakistan Environmental Protection

Act, 1997. The World Heritage Convention for protection of World Cultural and Natural Heritage is listed in the Schedule of Environmental Protection Act of 1997.

The 18th amendment in the constitution of Pakistan posed a challenge to governance for protection of World Cultural and Natural Heritage Sites as all provinces have made their own environmental laws. Whereas, international assistance under the "World Heritage Convention" is a financial assistance granted to the States Parties to the World Heritage Convention in order to help them protect the cultural or natural heritage sites inscribed on the "World Heritage List" or on the "List of World Heritage in Danger". The national and sub-national laws are not clear about to fix the responsible for protection of such heritage sites on national government or sub-national government. The change in multilevel composite classifications dealt with the flexibility approach resulted in the stimulation of adaptive governance literature addressing the uncertainty and revision to unanticipated upcoming fluctuations. Moreover, collaborative styles to expand the societal based institutional wisdom like in adaptive management is in dire need to be fostered with further research at all levels (Naelul & Ridwan, 2018).

The international, national and sub-national level governance frameworks are in dire need to be revisited with respect to the protection of cultural heritage across globe and Pakistan is not an exception. The shielding and safeguarding of cultural heritage sites, on the other hand, remained at very low priority list of disaster managers (Ferreira et al., 2021). The resilience style to governance questions demonstrates a prodigious transaction of capacity as it empowers a further polished considerate of the dynamics of faster, interwoven and multi-scale variation and this potential may not be underestimated (Duit et al., 2010). The studies revealed empathies of the anthropological dimensions of environmental modification be able to be empirically, conceptually and theoretically enriched through different knowledge domains including social, natural, human development sciences, comfort and growth and adversities and natural threats (LÓPEZ-MARRERO, 2010). The implication of anthropoid agency although recognized by environmental variation investigation tending to aggregate psycho-social factors and seldom take out the manifold and diverse scopes of agency and capacity (Campos-Guzmán et al., 2019).

It has been a matter of recent discussions that at which grade the World Heritage List imitates the multiplicity of heritage types. Although geographic, environmental and typological inequities for over a decade have been identified by the World heritage Committee but their comprehensive policy and present reviews of its application miss the mark to address a diverse kind of gap that is the comparative lack of heritage spots by negative association. The sites may be understood by a cluster as observing conflict and distress are referred to as negative heritage (Young, 2008).

The list may be unsuccessful to reflect the disputed nature of heritage in the essence of upholding a diversified relationship to the past which promotes questioning about its educational worth as an archive, the world Heritage Convention's upkeep of alternate memoirs and several previous and historical

explanations (Young, 2008). Tending to be interconnected and at time in unanticipated ways, global environmental problems do not happen in remoteness (Polasky, 2001). So, conceptualizing the universal environmental system as a multifaceted adaptive arrangement is comparatively a useful approach than to be considered in simple system (Norberg & Cumming, 2008).

Sustainable management and conservation along with the development of vacation industry has caught attention to be a dominant plans in the arena of heritage managing in contemporary world together with the diverse ideals of heritages and the safeguard of which are rationale (Genet & Kebede, 2021). The concerning, composite and devoted global concepts of World Heritage and Sustainable Development are operating interconnected and at rising phase of the development at sub-national levels of World Heritage Sites across the world (Taruvinga & Taruvinga, 2020). The natural and cultural sites of outstanding universal values (OUV) are defined as World Heritage and are liable to be protected legally by multinational treaties. The criteria for including and keeping these sites in World Heritage List has been provided by the World Heritage Convention of 1972 (Meskell, 2013).

The conservation of such listed sites aimed at the benefits of human society (Pendlebury et al., 2004) .Sustainable Development, on the other hand, referred as the development for meeting the essentials of existing but with no compromise on the capability of future age groups for meeting their own needs (Appendino, 2017). The conservation of heritage sites and sustainable development both can be implemented following strategies, principles and guidelines recognized by a wider range of stakeholders. Both notions i.e. World Heritage and Sustainable Development have recent and advanced functionalities but the earlier seems to be given extra emphasis than the later in their solicitation to heritage management (Job et al., 2017).

Both make a strong relationship which is continuously growing and can deeply be understood further by empirical analysis of their concerned applications at local and sub-national levels (Norberg & Cumming, 2008). Dogmatic undercurrents are over and over again unnoticed in assessment of environmental governance but new evidences explain that the interactions among global establishments and national governments result in shaping the environmental governance with upshot of 238 World heritage ecosystems under the world heritage convention between 1972 and 2019 (Morrison et al., 2020). Analysis of political dynamics in the governance of environmental issues including heritage sites delivers outlines of fruitful and counterproductive subtleties which may yield lessons to improve the environmental governance of heritage across the globe (Nursey-Bray & Rist, 2009).

To ease assignation through various theoretical philosophies, opinions of coalition between the 'ecosophical' viewpoints shared by Deleuzo-Guattarian post-humanism and by original thought, now represented by the expressivity thinking of Ngarrindjeri Yannarumi or 'Speaking as Country' are expanded. Homegrown ideas of existential interconnectivity fight modest combination

into the Western 'post'-humanism that they indeed lead by epochs; in its place they underwrite renewed substantial for an additional multiethnic or internationally eco-sophical (and so not as much of Eurocentric), non-humanist conceptualization of humanity and about its civilization. Debating the humanist dogmatic ontology subtending the neoliberal-capitalist view of 'service benefit', which notifies ample fashionable strategy for environmental governance, bearing in mind in what way the 'three ecologies' labelled by F´elix Guattari outline an interactive ontology of multifaceted co-implication that is Spinozist in its stimulus and is distinguishing of current Mainland post-humanism. The Native Ngarrindjeri Realm in Southern Australia take initiated a procedure of eco-friendly policy reform by collaborating an old-style thinking of environmental comfort and prioritizing this in contemporary governmental discussions regarding the liable administration of the Nation. An empathetic of humanoid accountability for deed understanding and unified advantage is obvious in the Ngarrindjeri Nation's determined for self-governance of their societal, financial and environmental businesses, and is work out transversally in the three collaborating ecologies of self, society and nature (Bignall et al., 2016).

The challenge of global environmental stewardship in 21st century can be addressed by key of environmental governance in perspective of sustainability using philosophies and concepts from the larger extent of commons. Multilevel governance can be enabled by common institutions which also play a key role in local participation in policy viz-a-viz decision making. The mixture of different regimes including sub-national, national, regional and global commons cannot be merely stated as the state-owned assets and the private property management (Dietz et al., 2003). The question is to bringing the governance closer to commons whose means of support are being affected by the conclusions (Martin, 2021). The public and local institutions should be given a heard in decision making process and opportunity to utilize their traditional and local wisdom to speed up the adaptive governance (Dietz et al., 2003; Job et al., 2017)). Further and advanced discussions concerning the homogenization of the understandings of heritage and of the relevancy of the list for local individualities and plans, with a mechanism of theoretical and geographic boundary making will help out in the development of site nomination (Young, 2008).

CONCLUSION
The natural catastrophe and damages to cultural and natural heritage are inevitable but the detrimental impacts can be mitigated if appropriate institutional arrangements are made. There are several gaps revealed in the regulatory institutions particularly governing the cultural heritage. The fast-changing worldwide characteristics need necessary adaptive governance which should be operationalized with a consideration of environment and heritage together because of mutual linkage and co-evolutionary interdependence of social and ecological systems. Governance for protection of environment, cultural and natural heritage got attention after World Heritage Convention followed by World Heritage Programme of UNESCO. The convention of protection of cultural and natural heritage requires states parties should review and reinforce governance frameworks within

management systems of World Heritage properties taking into account the environmental aspects. The protection of world cultural and natural heritage is also provided under environmental protection laws worldwide including Pakistan, which forms a nexus between environmental governance and heritage governance. It is a matter of grave concern that the World Heritage Governance at global level has not been studied in terms of socio-environmental and policy safeguards. While, relevant policy instruments changed from time to time thus acting as limiting factors for the protection and preservation of world cultural and natural heritage sites. Environmental protection laws of two sub-national units in Pakistan cover such sites and other do not even, where UNESCO Heritage sites are located. The environmental governance for protection of cultural and natural heritage in Pakistan became critical after 18th amendment in national constitution of Pakistan in 2010.

REFERENCES

Appendino, F. (2017). Balancing Heritage Conservation and Sustainable Development - The Case of Bordeaux. *IOP Conference Series: Materials Science and Engineering*, *245*(6), 062002. https://doi.org/10.1088/1757-899X/245/6/062002

AtKisson, A. (2009). *A Global Green New Deal for Climate, Energy, and Development*.

Bignall, S., Hemming, S., & Rigney, D. (2016). Three Ecosophies for the Anthropocene: Environmental Governance, Continental Posthumanism and Indigenous Expressivism. *Deleuze Studies*, *10*(4), 455–478. https://doi.org/10.3366/dls.2016.0239

Campos-Guzmán, V., García-Cáscales, M. S., Espinosa, N., & Urbina, A. (2019). Life Cycle Analysis with Multi-Criteria Decision Making: A review of approaches for the sustainability evaluation of renewable energy technologies. In *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews* (Vol. 104, pp. 343–366). Elsevier Ltd. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2019.01.031

Conejos, S., Langston, C., Chan, E. H. W., & Chew, M. Y. L. (2016). Governance of heritage buildings: Australian regulatory barriers to adaptive reuse. *Building Research and Information*, *44*(5–6), 507–519. https://doi.org/10.1080/09613218.2016.1156951

Crowther, & Lancaster. (2012). *Research Methods* (2nd ed.).

Dietz, T., Ostrom, E., & Stern, P. C. (2003). The Struggle to Govern the Commons. In *Science* (Vol. 302, Issue 5652, pp. 1907–1912). American Association for the Advancement of Science. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1091015

Duit, A., Galaz, V., Eckerberg, K., & Ebbesson, J. (2010). Governance, complexity, and resilience. In *Global Environmental Change* (Vol. 20, Issue 3, pp. 363–368). Pergamon. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2010.04.006

Ferreira, J. C., Vasconcelos, L., Monteiro, R., Silva, F. Z., Duarte, C. M., & Ferreira, F. (2021). Ocean Literacy to Promote Sustainable Development Goals and Agenda 2030 in Coastal Communities. *Education Sciences*, *11*(2), 62. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci11020062

Genet, A., & Kebede, M. (2021). Collections, local interactions, conservation

and tourism aspects of monastic heritage sites in the Lake Tana region of Ethiopia: the case of Mandeba Medahinealem Monastery. *Journal of Cultural Heritage Management and Sustainable Development*. https://doi.org/10.1108/JCHMSD-02-2020-0026

Hassan, Z. binti A., Jailani, M. A. K. bin, & Rahim, F. A. (2014). Assessing the Situational Analysis of Heritage Tourism Industry in Melaka. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *130*, 28–36. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.04.004

Job, H., Becken, S., & Lane, B. (2017). Protected Areas in a neoliberal world and the role of tourism in supporting conservation and sustainable development: an assessment of strategic planning, zoning, impact monitoring, and tourism management at natural World Heritage Sites. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, *25*(12), 1697–1718. https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2017.1377432

Khayam, & Ahmad. (2020). Decentralization of Environment in Pakistan: Issues in Governance. *Policy Perspectives*, *17*(2), 101. https://doi.org/10.13169/polipers.17.2.0101

Klein, U., & Müller, H. (2012). Humans and environment: cause and effect analysis supported by spatial data infrastructures. *FIG Working Week, Rome*.

Kotzé, L. J. (2020). Earth system law for the Anthropocene: rethinking environmental law alongside the Earth system metaphor. *Transnational Legal Theory*, *11*(1–2), 75–104. https://doi.org/10.1080/20414005.2020.1776556

Kreft, S., & Eckstein, D. (2013). Global Climate Risk Index 2014. *Germanwatch*, 28.

Leshikar-Denton, M. E. (2010). Cooperation is the Key: We Can Protect the Underwater Cultural Heritage. *Journal of Maritime Archaeology*, *5*(2), 85–95. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11457-010-9068-8

LÓPEZ-MARRERO, T. (2010). An integrative approach to study and promote natural hazards adaptive capacity: a case study of two flood-prone communities in Puerto Rico. *Geographical Journal*, *176*(2), 150–163. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-4959.2010.00353.x

Manglis, A., Fourkiotou, A., & Papadopoulou, D. (2021). The accessible underwater cultural heritage sites (AUCHS) as a sustainable tourism development opportunity in the Mediterranean region. *Tourism*, *68*(4), 499–503. https://doi.org/10.37741/T.68.4.9

Martin, J. B. (2021). Harnessing Local and Transnational Communities in the Global Protection of Underwater Cultural Heritage. *Transnational Environmental Law*, *10*(1), 85–108. https://doi.org/10.1017/S2047102520000369

Meskell, L. (2013). UNESCO's World Heritage Convention at 40. *Current Anthropology*, *54*(4), 483–494. https://doi.org/10.1086/671136

Morkūnaitė, Ž., Kalibatas, D., & Kalibatienė, D. (2019). A bibliometric data analysis of multi-criteria decision making methods in heritage buildings. *Journal of Civil Engineering and Management*, *25*(2), 76–99. https://doi.org/10.3846/jcem.2019.8315

Morrison, T. H., Adger, W. N., Brown, K., Hettiarachchi, M., Huchery, C., Lemos, M. C., & Hughes, T. P. (2020). Political dynamics and

governance of World Heritage ecosystems. *Nature Sustainability*, *3*(11), 947–955. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41893-020-0568-8

Naelul, N., & Ridwan, H. (2018). *The Importance of Empowering Local Community in Preserving Underwater Cultural Heritage in Indonesia: Case Study in Tulamben, Bali and in Taka Kappala, Selayar-South Sulawesi 1.*

Norberg, J., & Cumming, G. (2008). *Complexity Theory for a Sustainable Future Jon Norberg, Graeme Cumming - Google Books.*

Nursey-Bray, M., & Rist, P. (2009). Co-management and protected area management: Achieving effective management of a contested site, lessons from the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage Area (GBRWHA). *Marine Policy*, *33*(1), 118–127. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2008.05.002

Parthesius, R. (2011). Shared Heritage ? Shared Responsibility ? Reflections of the role of "sahred" colonial heritage within capacity building programs in the postcolonial world. *The 2011 Asia-Pacific Regional Conference on Underwater Cultural Heritage Proceedings.*

Pendlebury, J., Townshend, T., & Gilroy, R. (2004). The conservation of english cultural built heritage: A force for social inclusion? *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, *10*(1), 11–31. https://doi.org/10.1080/1352725032000194222

Phillips, H. (2015). The capacity to adapt to climate change at heritage sites-The development of a conceptual framework. *Environmental Science and Policy*, *47*, 118–125. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2014.11.003

Polasky, S. (2001). Fragile Dominion: Complexity and the Commons. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*, *83*(1), 246–247. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8276.t01-1-00151

Śladowski, G., & Paruch, R. (2017). Expert Cause and Effect Analysis of the Failure of Historical Structures Taking into Account Factors That are Difficult to Measure. In *Archives of Civil Engineering* (Vol. 63, Issue 2, pp. 165–186). De Gruyter Open Ltd. https://doi.org/10.1515/ace-2017-0023

Spennemann, D. H. R., & Graham, K. (2007). The importance of heritage preservation in natural disaster situations. *International Journal of Risk Assessment and Management*, *7*(6–7), 993–1001. https://doi.org/10.1504/IJRAM.2007.014670

Stone, P. G. (2015). The Challenge of Protecting Heritage in Times of Armed Conflict. *Museum International*, *67*(1–4), 40–54. https://doi.org/10.1111/muse.12079

Taruvinga, P., & Taruvinga, P. (2020). World Heritage, Sustainable Development, and Africa. In *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Anthropology*. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190854584.013.240

Yin, R. (2015). *Qualitative Research from Start to Finish: Second Edition.*

Young, O. (2008). *The Institutional Dimensions of Environmental Change | The MIT Press.*