



Kent Academic Repository

Labadi, Sophia (2018) *World Heritage and Gender Equality*. In: Larsen, Peter and Logan, William, eds. *World Heritage and Sustainable Development: new directions in World Heritage Management*. Routledge, London, pp. 87-100. ISBN 978-1-138-09139-9.

Downloaded from

<https://kar.kent.ac.uk/59117/> The University of Kent's Academic Repository KAR

The version of record is available from

This document version

Author's Accepted Manuscript

DOI for this version

Licence for this version

UNSPECIFIED

Additional information

Versions of research works

Versions of Record

If this version is the version of record, it is the same as the published version available on the publisher's web site. Cite as the published version.

Author Accepted Manuscripts

If this document is identified as the Author Accepted Manuscript it is the version after peer review but before type setting, copy editing or publisher branding. Cite as Surname, Initial. (Year) 'Title of article'. To be published in *Title of Journal*, Volume and issue numbers [peer-reviewed accepted version]. Available at: DOI or URL (Accessed: date).

Enquiries

If you have questions about this document contact ResearchSupport@kent.ac.uk. Please include the URL of the record in KAR. If you believe that your, or a third party's rights have been compromised through this document please see our [Take Down policy](https://www.kent.ac.uk/guides/kar-the-kent-academic-repository#policies) (available from <https://www.kent.ac.uk/guides/kar-the-kent-academic-repository#policies>).

Chapter 6

World Heritage and gender equality

Sophia Labadi

Achieving gender equality is integral to sustainable development. How can such a virtuous concept as sustainable development be achieved if women – ‘half the sky’, as the ancient Chinese proverb poetically call them – are marginalized, suffer from discrimination and inequalities and have their needs discredited? Gender equality is a top priority of the UN and its specialized agencies. This commitment, among other things, led to the creation of the United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women initiative (better known as UN Women) in July 2010. Gender equality has also been a global priority at UNESCO (one of the only two, with Priority Africa) for almost a decade. In addition, achieving gender equality and the empowerment of all women and girls is a full Sustainable Development Goal (and was also a full Millennium Development Goal).

What were these programs, and what was their impact at the UN and UNESCO? What were the different theories that guided these programs? How has gender equality been addressed within the policy discourse and implementation of the World Heritage Convention? What are the key recommendations of the section on ‘achieving gender equality’ in the UNESCO ‘Policy for the integration of a Sustainable Development Perspective into the processes of the World Heritage Convention’? Why were these recommendations proposed?

To address these questions, this chapter first provides a critical analysis of the different efforts by the UN and UNESCO to achieve gender equality and the empowerment of women, whilst also explaining the different theoretical frameworks which have guided these efforts. It then analyses how gender equality and the empowerment of women have been interpreted and implemented within the World Heritage framework, highlighting key issues and shortcomings. Having demonstrated the fundamental importance of the section on ‘achieving gender equality’ as part of the policy on World Heritage and sustainable development, a last section details its key features and how the author of this article took into careful consideration the existing issues with gender and World Heritage in the drafting process of the policy.

Gender equality at the UN and UNESCO – the wider framework

Gender equality and the empowerment of women have occupied a major position within the United Nations, as demonstrated by the impressive and diverse list of activities and events organized over more than 30 years. This includes the adoption of 1975 as the International Women's Year and 8th March as the International Women's day, which, every year, celebrates the social, economic, cultural and political achievements of women and the advances in respect of their rights as well as calling for action on empowering women and achieving gender parity. Another key event was the UN decade for women (1976–1985), a key result of which was the adoption in 1979 of the *Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women* by the UN General Assembly. This convention has so far been ratified by 189 Member States. It outlines women's social, cultural, political and economic rights, what constitutes discrimination or prejudice against women as well as measures for national actions to end these discriminations or prejudices in order to realize equality between women and men. In addition, four UN World conferences on women (organized in Mexico City in 1975, Copenhagen in 1980, Nairobi in 1985 and Beijing in 1995) have aimed at locating the issues facing women at the centre of the global arena and agenda, as well as to set common objectives and plans of action (Chen 1995: 477–478). The 1995 Beijing Declaration and the Platform for Action, in particular, recognized the crucial link between poverty eradication and gender equality. The continued and renewed importance that the UN gave to gender equality and the empowerment of women led to the creation of a single entity solely responsible for these themes, that is, the United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (better known as UN Women) in July 2010. This organization aims to coordinate the UN system's work on gender equality and the empowerment of women, to help intergovernmental bodies in the formulation of policies, standards and norms, as well as monitoring the implementation of these initiatives and related activities. It also aims to help Member States to implement these policies, standards, norms and activities.

Different philosophical and conceptual approaches have framed and guided all these different initiatives and events. This includes the 'Women in Development' approach, formulated in the early 1970s (Tinker 1990: 30). For proponents of this approach, women had been marginalized up until then or excluded from every aspect of development. They were particularly marginalized or excluded from key administrative and political roles related to the planning, development and implementation of development projects at international, national and local levels (Boserup 1970; Benaría and Sen 1982: 161; Rogers 1980). As a consequence, women had not benefited from development projects, which primarily addressed men's concerns, and benefited men first and foremost. According to this approach, greater inclusion of women in development projects, mainly in high-level roles, would help solve these issues of marginalization and exclusion.

However, another view, the 'Women and Development approach', inspired by Marxism and dependency theory, argues that women have in fact always been involved in development processes and projects. Yet, they have been heavily exploited in their majority and far more than men, particularly in developing countries. Examples abound, for instance, women artisans are often underpaid and work in an unregulated labor force, making souvenirs for tourists or crafts to be exported to North America, Europe or the Asian markets. Another example of this exploitation are the women that work in manufacturing, particularly in the clothing and textile sectors, who provide cheap and flexible labour and have only very few rights (Mies 1982; Lim 1983). This approach calls for women-only development projects which will remove them from capitalist, imperialist and patriarchal exploitation (*ibid.*: 80).

This 'Women and Development' approach has a number of shortcomings. Women are considered as a homogeneous and coherent group; in other words, they are essentialized. Another related issue is that men are always seen to be privileged and dominant. This has led to the stereotyping of both women and men. For instance, women from the Middle East are often portrayed as overtly submissive, whilst the reality is far more complex.

The 'Gender and Development' approach which has become dominant within the UN system developed out of the shortcomings of the 'Women in Development' and the 'Women and Development' approaches (Oakley 1972; Moser 1993). This 'Gender and Development' approach focuses on the interconnected social relations between women and men and the need to challenge gender roles. This approach moves away from considering gender issues uniquely through female lens (Ostergaard 1992: 6). Not only has this approach helped to consider the variability of gender relations in time and space (Schech and Haggis 2000: 96), but it has also helped to deconstruct some of the long-held stereotypes about women. The 'nimble fingers' of women, for instance, which has led to their massive employment in manufacturing jobs, has been explained as being learnt skills, rather than a natural characteristic (Elson and Pearson 1988: 21). One of the recent initiatives reflecting this approach is the 'HeForShe' campaign initiated by the UN Women in 2014. It was made visible, in part, thanks to the different actions taken by the actor Emma Watson, also UN Women Goodwill Ambassador, notably her 2014 speech and the 2015 live Facebook conversation, widely circulated online.¹ This initiative considers boys and men as central to addressing some of the social, economic, political and cultural issues leading to the marginalization and inequalities faced by girls and women. This popular campaign highlights that the issues and inequalities faced by women should not be constricted to, or only resolved by women. On the contrary, this initiative has approached the topic as a human rights issue that concerns everybody and deserves a collective solution.

Despite the different and diverse programs and activities developed and implemented by the UN, guided by these theoretical approaches, major problems still affect gender equality and women's empowerment, leading Koehler to sum up the current situation in these terms: 'Not a single country has achieved the gender

equality goals agreed in 1995' (2015: 746). The long lists of targets associated with the UN Sustainable Development Goal 5 (henceforth SDG, adopted in September 2015) and its targets provide more specific indications of these problems. This goal aims to 'achieve gender equality and empower all girls and women'. The different associated targets include: the need to end 'all forms of discrimination and all forms of violence against women', to eliminate 'all harmful practices', to '[e]nsure women's full and effective participation and equal opportunities for leadership at all levels of decision-making' and to 'undertake reforms to give women equal rights to economic resources, as well as access to ownership and control over land and other forms of property, financial services, inheritance and natural resources, in accordance with national laws' (United Nations 2015). This list demonstrates that the previous Millennium Development Goal 3, which aimed to promote gender equality and empower women through eliminating gender disparity in primary and secondary education, might not have been as encompassing or successful as originally believed (Fehling, Nelson and Venkatapuram 2013: 1109–1122; Subrahmanian 2005).

UNESCO, as a specialized agency of the UN has had a parallel concern for gender equality and the empowerment of women. Since 2008, gender equality has been one of the Organization's two overarching global priorities, along with Priority Africa (Forss 2013: 1). This means that all sectors of UNESCO should initiate, develop and implement gender-specific activities and programs, interventions, partnerships and networks. To guide the actions of UNESCO, two Gender Equality Action Plans have been adopted, the first one ran from 2008 to 2013 and the second one is running from 2014 to 2021. In addition, UNESCO has had a special unit dedicated to the promotion of the status of women and gender equality for almost 20 years (Forss 2013: 10). Maybe one of the most visible and well-known initiatives and partnerships is the L'Oréal-UNESCO 'For Women in Science' program which aims to recognize, promote and enhance the role of women in science through an award. Since 1998, the L'Oréal-UNESCO award has recognized more than 97 laureates from 30 countries. Every year, the laureates are the subjects of a highly visible promotion campaign with panels in airports and public transports. Another action has taken the shape of a training program on gender equality, supposedly mandatory for all UNESCO staff since 2005 (Forss 2013: iii). This program aims to make staff aware of the key concepts, goals and issues related to gender equality as well as introducing ways in which to implement them in their daily work. However, there have been no incentives or accountability mechanisms put in place to encourage staff to undertake this training program (*ibid.* iv). In addition, the program does not contain practical tasks related to developing gender specific activities, making it difficult to include this training in daily work and translate it into practice (*ibid.* 12). UNESCO's approach to gender equality and the empowerment of women has also been based on a strong commitment to cultural diversity and the enjoyment of culture as a driver and enabler of people-centered development, as detailed in the UNESCO Report on Gender Equality, Heritage and Creativity (UNESCO 2014a). But how has this concern for gender equality been applied to World Heritage?

Gender equality and World Heritage – taking stock

Gender equality seems to be a key idea and concern driving the implementation of the World Heritage Convention, particularly with the increased consideration given to local community involvement and to a human-rights approach to heritage conservation. As clarified by Farida Shaheed, the former Special Rapporteur in the field of cultural rights: ‘The realization of equal cultural rights demands that women and girls are able to access, participate in, and contribute to all aspects of cultural life on a basis of equality with men and boys’ (Shaheed 2014). In other words, a human-rights based approach to World Heritage cannot be possible without gender equality. This represents an evolution in the understanding and implementation of the World Heritage Convention, which, at the time of its adoption in 1972, did not make any reference to gender equality or the roles of women and men, as well as their empowerment through World Heritage (Rössler 2014: 61). Gender equality concerns all aspects of the convention, as gender relations are infused throughout the implementation of this legal instrument, from the identification of heritage, to its conservation and management and its interpretation. In addition, gender equality stands at the heart of integrating a sustainable development perspective within the processes of the World Heritage Convention. Indeed, no development can be sustainable, just and equitable without removing the inequalities facing half of the population.

Activities aimed at achieving gender equality and the empowerment of women within the implementation of the convention have been regularly reported on by the UNESCO Director General at the General Conferences (see, for instance, UNESCO 2013b, 2015a). These reports reveal that gender equality has been understood primarily as ensuring the parity in the participation of women and men in projects, activities and capacity-building workshops. This concern for parity has characterized all programs, including the World Heritage Education program and its youth fora and capacity building activities, ~~which aim to have an equal participation of boys and girls~~. In addition, specific activities at an individual property level have aimed to benefit women socially and economically, as is the case, for instance, in the project, ‘Social inclusion of women and young people through earthen architecture driven traditional handwork techniques’ implemented in the City of Cuenca, Peru (UNESCO 2015; see also Galla 2012 for more examples). Besides, it is worth mentioning the appointment, for the first time, of a woman, Dr Mechthild Rössler, as Director of the World Heritage Centre (as well as Director of the Heritage Division) in 2015. This is very important, considering that the latest version of the UNESCO Priority Gender Equality Action Plan notes the “‘glass ceiling” for women to reach senior management positions or to participate in decision-making processes’ (UNESCO 2014b: 37). Finally, concerns for gender equality within the implementation of the convention have led to an entire issue of the World Heritage Review dedicated to this theme (UNESCO 2016).

However, important shortcomings can be identified in the current approach to gender equality as part of the implementation of the World Heritage Convention. First, the World Heritage Committee has not adopted a general gender policy,

but has only occasionally referred to gender equality in its decisions (UNESCO 2013a). This absence makes the section on gender a vital part of the 'Policy for the integration of a sustainable development perspective into the processes of the World Heritage Convention' presented below. In addition, as I have just explained, too often, implementation of the gender priority within the framework of the convention has been equated with a balanced participation of women and men (or girls and boys) in different activities, projects or capacity-building workshops. This is clearly reflected in the performance indicators and benchmarks identified to monitor the implementation of the global priority on gender equality within the framework of the convention, as presented in the UNESCO Program and budget document (also known as 'the C/5'). The UNESCO Program and budget document for 2014–2017, for instance, identifies as the 'number of World Heritage properties where the balanced contribution of women and men to conservation is demonstrated' one of the performance indicators. ~~For instance, State Parties to the convention are encouraged 'to increase women's active participation in World Heritage Committees and related management and conservation initiatives for World Heritage'~~ (UNESCO 2014: 163). However, this balanced participation does not necessarily lead to gender equality or the empowerment of women. It reflects more the 'women in development' theory presented previously. Indeed, these activities, indicators and benchmarks denote more a concern for the inclusion of women in training sessions and available opportunities than for the nature of this participation. It is unclear whether and how such participation changes the gender and power relations or the social construction of gender at World Heritage properties (see also Mosse 2005: 150).

Another issue concerns references to women in nomination dossiers, these being considered as key documents for the long-term interpretation, management and conservation of heritage properties. It could have been expected, naively, that these documents would have put women, gender equality and the empowerment of women at their heart to respect UNESCO's vision, approaches and priorities. However, in-depth analyses of a selection of 114 nomination dossiers revealed a clear marginalization of the references to women or gender relations (Labadi 2013: 77–93, 2007: 161–164). References to women amount to only a few sentences of some nomination dossiers, with some exceptions such as the Flemish Béguinages in Belgium, inscribed not only for their urban and architectural characteristics, but also for the cultural tradition of independent religious women in north-western Europe (Government of Belgium 1997). These few references strongly position women at the margin of the text, history and heritage, and make them invisible, secondary and forgettable. This marginalization stands in stark contrast to the long descriptions of famous men related to nominated properties. In a number of cases, famous men are used to define the outstanding universal value of the nominated property. This is not the case for most women in the sampled analysed. Worse, some references tend to be a vehicle for stereotypical personal characteristics of women, describing them as sentimental, hysterical, prone to making decisions based on emotion and incapable of rational action. It

could have been thought that this focus on the ‘great men of history’ could have changed in recent years, especially after UNESCO defined gender equality as one of its two global priorities. Yet, on the contrary, the focus on the great men of history has increased in the recent nomination dossiers. There are now entire dossiers focusing on great men and their deeds, as is the case with the serial nomination of ‘The Architectural Work of Le Corbusier’ (France, Argentina, Belgium, Germany, India, Japan and Switzerland), inscribed on the World Heritage List in 2016. This marginalization, or even invisibility has also been identified in States of Conservation Reports for natural heritage sites. Out of the 1,290 SOC reports assessed by IUCN, only nine referred to women or issues of gender equality and women’s participation at these natural heritage sites (Bastian, Gilligan and Clabots 2016).


These results confirm previous publications on the matter which have also documented heritage and history as being predominantly male-centred (Smith 2008; Lowenthal 1998). This invisibility of women is more related to the fact that women’s stories and actions are not as well promoted as men’s deeds, rather than women being passive or only working in private spheres (see also Rössler, Cameron and Selfslagh 2016: 6). This invisibility thus reflects power relations at heritage properties, as well as who has the authority to decide what constitutes the significance of World Heritage (or heritage in general). Obscuring women in nomination dossiers is problematic as it reproduces gender inequalities. Indeed, best practice encourages the identification of all the values that make the property significant to ensure they guide the long-term management of the property. If the histories of women are not brought forward, then some important social, historical or cultural events related to them might not be recorded, and a holistic management of the property will never be implemented. Besides, to allow women to be empowered – that is, to take control of their lives through building self-confidence and self-reliance – women need to have their history and heritage recognized, valued and promoted. Indeed, such recognition would reveal that there exist many women who have done great deeds, just like their male counterparts in shaping World Heritage. Without this recognition, contemporary women will continue to be marginalized and stereotyped and to be considered as inferior to men. Above all, seriously taking account of gender relations at the property level would make it necessary to look ‘at women’s experiences vis-à-vis men and vice versa (as well as to other genders beyond the male-female binary) and the power negotiations involved in that’ (Blake 2014: 50). This will never be possible if only men and their perspectives are considered and valued.

This invisibility of women was reflected, until recently, in the choice of experts from ICOMOS undertaking evaluation missions to evaluate the authenticity, integrity, protection, conservation and management of nominated properties. From 2006 to 2008, 70 per cent of ICOMOS experts were men (Tabet 2010: 25). This imbalance was repeated in the breakdown of World Heritage panel members from ICOMOS whose role was to adopt recommendations on nominated properties, with 77 per cent of men compared with 23 per cent of women, again from 2006 to 2008 (*ibid*: 28). This gender imbalance was also found, but exacerbated,

in the IUCN evaluators who used to carry out site visits, with 33 male evaluators out of a total of 34 in the period 2001–2004 (Cameron 2005: 8). In response to these findings, both ICOMOS and IUCN have stated that they have taken steps to ensure a greater gender balance in the experts undertaking evaluation missions (Rössler, Cameron and Selfslagh 2016: 9), although no figures seem yet to have been published.

Moving forward: achieving gender equality at World Heritage properties

Such shortcomings just detailed made it necessary to include a section on ‘Achieving gender equality’, as part of the dimension on ‘Inclusive Social Development’, within the ‘Policy for the integration of a sustainable development perspective into the processes of the World Heritage Convention’. To ensure policy coherence within the UN sustainable development agenda, this section on achieving gender equality reflects the SDG 5 and some of its key targets. The Priority Gender Equality Action Plan (2014–2021) was also used as a guide to draft the section, and I sought to respect its vision, principles, definitions and objectives. Besides this section on ‘Achieving gender equality’ fully reflects and respects the ~~principles, ideas and acts upon the recommendations~~ proposed in the UNESCO report on Gender Equality, Heritage and Creativity (UNESCO 2014a: 135). Guidance was also provided by UNESCO Gender Equality division, and the IUCN Global Gender Office and their comments on earlier versions of the draft policy were also fully integrated. Finally, the section took into ~~full~~ account the shortcomings I had identified of previous approaches to gender equality and the empowerment of women within the implementation of the World Heritage Convention.

This section of the policy aims to mainstream a gender perspective; that is, to make women’s, as well as men’s, concerns, experiences, knowledge and expertise integral dimensions of the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of policies and programs related to the World Heritage Convention (UNESCO 2014b: 15). This will pave the way to gender equality, that is, for ‘women and men to enjoy the same status and have equal opportunity to realize their full human rights and potential to contribute to national, political, economic, social and cultural development’ (UNESCO 2014b: 60). This will also help to ensure that women and men benefit equally from the implementation of the convention, and so that inequality is not perpetuated or exacerbated. To rectify this imbalance, the section adheres to, and integrates, the three interrelated components of the right to take part in cultural life as: (a) participation in; (b) access to; and (c) contribution to cultural life (Shaheed 2014). The section on gender equality also aims to empower women, that is, to ensure that they have control over their lives, gain skills, build self-confidence and develop self-reliance (ibid.). Finally, the section aims to facilitate the adoption by State ties of ‘gender-sensitive, gender-responsive and gender-transformative policies’ and practices in the field of heritage’, in line with the principles from the action plan (UNESCO 2014b: 38).

The definitions proposed were based on the UNESCO Priority Gender Equality Action plan, even though the definition of gender as the ‘social meaning given to being a woman or a man’ (UNESCO 2014b: 60) was criticized during the Cottbus and Ninh Binh meetings discussing the policy on World Heritage and sustainability. Indeed, for some experts, this definition was too simplistic: it did not go beyond the male/female binary and did not take account of the complexity and diversity of genders, including a-gender, gender-fluid or third gender. By adopting this definition from UNESCO, this section thus excludes some genders currently practiced and recognized.

More specifically, the section of the policy calls on State Parties, first, to ‘ensure respect for gender equality throughout the full cycle of World Heritage processes, particularly in the preparation and content of nomination dossiers’ (UNESCO 2015b). This focus on nomination dossiers aims to ensure that the interests, needs and priorities of both women and men are considered right from the earliest stages of the World Heritage process. In addition, such a focus could help to address some of the issues discussed earlier, in particular the invisibility of women and their views, values and history in nomination dossiers. Such representation should help to fight against negative stereotyping, and forms of discriminations against women as well as change power relations at site levels, in line with the first target of SDG 5. To achieve such a recommendation, more inclusive teams should be formed to prepare nomination dossiers and management plans, greater account should be paid to hidden, but nonetheless significant, histories at the site level and greater use should be made of international networks that have filled the gender gap. In addition, the format for the nomination of properties for inscription on the World Heritage List should be revised to ensure that the description of the property, its history and development and explanation of its outstanding universal value fully reflect the local cultural diversity and the key values they associate with the property. This will ensure a holistic and comprehensive approach to the protection of the outstanding universal value of the property, as well as its management and conservation.

Second, the policy urges State Parties to ‘[e]nsure social and economic opportunities for both women and men in and around World Heritage properties’ (UNESCO 2015b). This recommendation was brought up during the discussions on the draft policy. It was recognized that providing equal social and economic opportunities to women and men is still rare, despite some notable projects such as those mentioned earlier. For this reason, women remain disproportionately affected by poverty, exploitation or marginalization. Hence, there was a need to request clearly that equal social and economic opportunities are provided for in and around World Heritage properties and not necessarily or solely in tourism. Implementing this recommendation would lead to income generation for women, poverty reduction and the empowerment of women. This second recommendation reflects one of the targets of the UN SDG 5, which aims to ‘give women equal rights to economic resources, as well as access to ownership and control over land and other forms of property, financial services, inheritance and natural resources, in accordance with national laws’. A first step to implement this recommendation

would be to gather best practices, as published, for instance, by IUCN (see, for instance, Koirala, Gurung and Sharma 2004) or by UN Women, to determine how these could be applied in and around World Heritage properties.

The third recommendation urges State Parties to '[e]nsure equal and respectful consultation, full and effective participation and equal opportunities for leadership and representation of both women and men within activities for the conservation and management of World Heritage properties' (UNESCO 2015b). This was carefully drafted to reflect UN SDG 5.5, which aims to ensure 'women's full and effective participation and equal opportunities for leadership at all levels of decision-making'. This element is not only about the mere participation of women but also about their opportunity to influence decision-making processes and to challenge and change power relations at national and local levels on using heritage for sustainable development. One way to implement this recommendation would be to revise the format for the nomination of properties for inscription on the World Heritage List and request explanations of the different consultations undertaken. It would then be important to analyse the different ways in which equal and respectful consultation and full and effective participation were undertaken and how they would be ensured throughout the full cycle of World Heritage processes and the long-term management of the property.

The last recommendation addresses issues concerning women's access to World Heritage properties. It reflects discussions held during the drafting of this policy concerning World Heritage properties whose access is forbidden to women. The exploratory discussion focused on one property in particular: Mount Athos in Greece. Inscribed in 1988, it is a holy mountain with around twenty monasteries inhabited by some 1,400 monks (Rössler 2014: 83). One of the fundamental practices of monastic life is the 'avaton', with one of its rules which forbids women and children from entering or staying on Mount Athos (Papayannis 2016: 16–17). However, as explained by Farida Shaheed and as already quoted: 'The realization of equal cultural rights demands that women and girls are able to access, participate in, and contribute to all aspects of cultural life on a basis of equality with men and boys' (2014). In order to do so, women should have the right to determine on an equal basis with men whether they want to access heritage properties, and which values or traditions should be kept or discarded. To respect and realize fully cultural rights at World Heritage properties, the last recommendation of the policy thus requires State Parties, when or where relevant,

to ensure that gender-rooted traditional practices within World Heritage properties, for example in relation to access or participation in management mechanisms, have received the full consent of all groups within the local communities through transparent consultation processes that fully respects gender equality.

(UNESCO 2015b)

The integration of this gender lens and wider sustainable development perspective into the processes of the World Heritage Convention will require the building of necessary capacities among practitioners, institutions, concerned communities and networks across a wide interdisciplinary and inter-sectorial spectrum, as highlighted in paragraph 11 of the policy (UNESCO 2015b). In addition, new research should aim at collecting best practices in implementing the different recommendations as well as in establishing gender-sensitive, gender-responsible and gender-transformative policies and practices. These best practices should be widely disseminated. Finally, gender-specific data and statistics should be regularly collected to monitor and measure progress, and inform future strategy. To assess the effectiveness of these initiatives, the Gender Equality Marker at UNESCO should be used. This tool aims to measure the extent to which initiatives or projects contribute to the promotion and realization of gender equality. It follows a simple four-point scale from 'gender unaware' to 'gender transformative'. A gender transformative activity, policy or program will provide, for instance, gender-related expertise, gender-related performance indicator(s) and corresponding target(s) or gender-related expected results. Using this tool will help to track progress and help to revise activity, policy and programs that do not show awareness of gender equality principles or will not lead to it. To ensure some accountability, a World Heritage gender focal point should be tasked to report back regularly to the Committee on progress on achieving gender equality.

Conclusion

This chapter has explained that both the UN and UNESCO, as one of the UN's specialized agencies, have made gender equality a key priority. Yet, many issues are still preventing the full achievement of gender equality and the empowerment of women, as illustrated by the long list of targets associated with the Sustainable Development Goal 5.

Within the framework of the World Heritage Convention, an increasing number of activities promoting gender equality have been implemented, with the importance given to local communities and the development of a human-rights approach to heritage conservation. However, these activities present a number of shortcomings, including a general focus on parity between women and men, rather than specifically on changing power relations and gender inequalities at World Heritage properties. In addition, key documents related to the implementation of the convention, particularly nomination dossiers, do not reflect principles or specific concerns of gender equality or the empowerment of women. No effort has been made to encourage State Parties to nominate sites associated with women or to include references to them in nomination dossiers. Thus, nomination dossiers have predominantly been male-centred, as reflected, for instance, with the recent inscription of the architectural work of Le Corbusier on the World Heritage List in 2016. This invisibility of women was reflected, until recently, in

the choice of experts from the Advisory Bodies evaluating nomination dossiers. Above all, the Committee has never adopted a general gender policy.

These shortcomings have made the section on ‘Achieving gender equality’ a fundamental part of the ‘Policy for the integration of a sustainable development perspective into the processes of the World Heritage Convention’. The section respects the UNESCO Priority Gender Action Plan and reflects some of the targets of the SDG 5. Suggestions for the implementation of this section include the need to revise the format of nomination dossier, to respect and reflect better cultural diversity in the different World Heritage processes or to gather best practices on providing equal social and economic opportunities to women and men and apply them at World Heritage properties. These changes, if implemented, would go a long way towards ensuring that gender equality and the empowerment of women become a reality at World Heritage.

Notes

- 1 Emma Watson’s 2014 speech is available at: www.youtube.com/watch?v=gkjW9PZBRfk. Her 2015 live Facebook conversation is available at: www.facebook.com/emmawatson/posts/1032692416749648.
- 2 Gender sensitive, according to UNESCO, means ‘acknowledging differences and inequalities between women and men as requiring attention’. Gender responsive includes the definition of gender sensitive but also articulates ‘policies and initiatives which address the different needs, aspirations, capacities and contributions of women and men’. A gender transformative approach challenges ‘existing and biased/discriminatory policies, practices, programs and affect change for the betterment of life for all’.

References

- Bastian, L., Gilligan, M. and Clabots, B. (2016). *Gender and Protected Areas: Exploring National Reporting to the Ramsar Convention and the World Heritage Convention*. Washington: IUCN.
- Benaria, L. and Sen, G. (1982). ‘Class and gender inequalities and women’s role in economic development-theoretical and practical implications’, *Feminist Studies*, 8(1), 157–176.
- Blake, J. (2014). ‘Gender and intangible heritage’, in UNESCO (ed), *Gender Equality, Heritage and Creativity*. Paris: UNESCO, pp. 48–79.
- Boserup, E. (1970). *Women’s Role in Economic Development*. London: George Allen and Unwin.
- Cameron, C. (2005). *Evaluation of IUCN’s Work in World Heritage Nominations*. Gland: IUCN.
- Chen, M. (1995). ‘Engendering world conferences: The international women’s movement and the United Nations’, *Third World Quarterly*, 16(3), 477–494.
- Elson, D. and Pearson, R. (1988). ‘The subordination of women and the internationalization of factory production’, in K. Young et al. (eds), *Of Marriage and the Market: Women’s Subordination Internationally and Its Lessons*. London: Routledge, pp. 18–40.
- Fehling, M., Nelson, B. D. and Venkatapuram, S. (2013). ‘Limitations of the millennium development goals: A literature review’, *Global Public Health*, 8(10), 1109–1122.

- Forss, K. (2013). *Review of UNESCO's Priority Gender Equality*. Paris: UNESCO.
- Galla, A. (2012). *World Heritage: Benefits beyond Borders*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Government of Belgium. (1997). *Nomination of the Flemish Béguinages for Inclusion on the World Heritage List*.
- Koehler, G. (2015). 'Seven decades of "development" and now what?', *Journal of International Development*, 27(6), 733–751.
- Koirala, I., Gurung, R. and Sharma, D. (2004). *Monitoring Gender, Poverty and Social Equity in Natural Resource Management: Best Practice Resources and Annotated Bibliography*. IUCN Nepal Country Office.
- Labadi, S. (2007). 'Representations of the nation and cultural diversity in discourses on World Heritage', *Journal of Social Archaeology*, 7(2), 310–330.
- Labadi, S. (2013). *UNESCO, Cultural Heritage, and Outstanding Universal Value*. Plymouth, MA: AltaMira Press.
- Lim, L. (1983). 'Capitalism, imperialism and patriarchy: The dilemma of Third World women workers in multinational factories', in J. Nash and M. P. Fernandez-Kelly (eds), *Women, Men and the International Division of Labour*. Albany: State University of New York Press, pp. 70–91.
- Lowenthal, D. (1998). *The Heritage Crusade and the Spoils of History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mies, M. (1982). *The Lace Makers of Narsapur: Indian Housewives Produce for the World Market*. London: Zed Books.
- Moser, C. (1993). *Taylor Planning & Development: Theory, Practice and Training*. London: Routledge.
- Mosse, D. (2005). *Cultivating Development: An Ethnography of Aid Policy and Practice*. London: Pluto Press.
- Oakley, A. (1972). *Sex, Gender and Society*. London: Temple Smith.
- Ostergaard, L. (1992). *Gender and Development: A Practical Guide*. London: Roy.
- Papayannis, T. (2016). 'Mount athos-more than just a man's world', *World Heritage Review*, 78, 12–19.
- Rogers, B. (1980). *The Domestication of Women: Discrimination in Developing Countries*. London: Tavistock.
- Rössler, M. (2014). 'Gendered World Heritage? A review of the implementation of the UNESCO World Heritage Convention', in P. Keenan, K. Nowacka and L. Patchett (eds), *Gender Equality, Heritage and Creativity*. Paris: UNESCO, pp. 60–72.
- Rössler, M., Cameron, C. and Selfslagh, B. (2016). 'World Heritage and gender', *World Heritage Review*, 78, 4–11.
- Schech, S. and Haggis, J. (2000). *Culture and Development: A Critical Introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Shaheed, F. (2014). 'Foreword', in UNESCO (ed), *Gender Equality, Heritage and Creativity*. Paris: UNESCO.
- Smith, L. (2008). 'Heritage, gender and identity', in B. Graham and P. Howard (eds), *The Ashgate Research Companion to Heritage and Identity*. Aldershot: Ashgate, pp. 159–178.
- Subrahmanian, R. (2005). 'Gender equality in education: Definitions and measurements', *International Journal of Educational Development*, 25, 395–407.
- Tabet, J. (2010). *Review of ICOMOS Working Methods and Procedures for the Evaluation of Cultural and Mixed Properties*. Paris: ICOMOS.

- Tinker, I. (1990). *Persistent Inequalities: Women and World Development*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- UNESCO (2010). *Approved Program and Budget*. Paris: UNESCO.
- UNESCO (2013a). *Item 13 of the Provisional Agenda: Draft Policy Guidelines: World Heritage Committee: 37th Session*. Paris: UNESCO.
- UNESCO (2013b). *Report by the Director-General on UNESCO's Actions Promoting Women's Empowerment and Gender Equality-37th Session of the General Conference*. Paris: UNESCO.
- UNESCO (2014a). *Gender Equality, Heritage and Creativity*. Paris: UNESCO.
- UNESCO (2014b). *UNESCO Priority Gender Equality Action Plan-2014-2021*. Paris: UNESCO.
- UNESCO (2015a). *Report by the Director-General on UNESCO's Actions Promoting Women's Empowerment and Gender Equality-38th Session of the General Conference*. Paris: UNESCO.
- UNESCO (2015b). *Policy Document for the Integration of a Sustainable Development Perspective into the Processes of the World Heritage Convention* (online). Available at: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/sustainabledevelopment/> (accessed 2 December 2017).
- UNESCO (2016). *World Heritage and Gender Equality*. no. 78. Paris: UNESCO.
- United Nations (2015). *Sustainable Development Goals*. Available at: www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/ (accessed 7 March 2017).

Taylor & Francis
Not for distribution