

The risks that threaten the cultural heritages in the event of armed conflict

Fabio Maniscalco

1. Introduction

The war, especially during the last two centuries, has been the main cause of the destruction, the corruption and the disappearance of the international cultural heritage.¹ Cultural heritage that becomes "strategical objective" for various reasons:

- Military strategic reasons -e.g. the bombing of Monte Cassino² or of Dresden³ during World War II, or the destruction of the Stari Most,⁴ during the conflict in the Former Yugoslavia⁵ (Figs 1-3).
- Powerful of weapons -e.g. the extensive damage to Iraqi antiquities during the recent war⁶ or the devastation of sixty three percent of Croatia's Dubrovnik.⁷
- Ethnic and/or religious causes, that involve the destruction of enemy's cultural identity, especially in the occupied areas -e.g. the destruction of the Turkish and of the Orthodox shrines of Cyprus⁸ or of the Baha'i holy places in Iran⁹ (Fig. 4).
- Political reasons or *damnatio memoriae* of the previous regimes -e.g. the devastation of the Iraqi archives, libraries and Saddam's palaces.
- Military logistic needs -e.g. the occupation of the ancient site of Babylon from the coalition troops.¹⁰
- Accidental bombing of cultural property because of human error or of construction defects.¹¹
- Terrorism, because the deliberate destruction of enemy's cultural and/or cultural patrimony is a measure of annihilation of enemy's power or of fanatic subjugation -e.g. the destruction of Bamiyan Buddhas or of many monuments in Afghanistan¹² (Fig. 5).

¹ About the general problems of protection of cultural property in the event of armed conflict, see Lavachery, Noblecourt 1954; Boylan 1993; Clément 1994, 11-25; Maniscalco 1999; Maniscalco 2002; Maniscalco forthcoming.

² Because of the bombing, the historic monastery of Monte Cassino, where St. Benedict first established the rule that ordered monasticism in the west, was entirely destroyed. Fortunately its unique library had been removed for safekeeping to Rome at the start of the battle by the Germans. About the destruction of Montecassino see Bloch 1979; Böhmler 1964; Bond 1994; Parker 2004.

³ See Irving 1965; Taylor 2005.

⁴ About the damages to the cultural property of Mostar see AA.VV. 1992; Lévi Strauss 2002, 146-148; Mengozzi 2002, 159-168.

⁵ See Glennly 1992; IPCS 1994; AA.VV. 1995a; Kaiser, von Imhoff 1995, *passim*; RDC 1995; Maniscalco 1997.

⁶ About Iraqi cultural property see AA.VV. 2003; Saporetti, Vidale 2003; ICOM 2003; Maniscalco 2003, 84-85; Fales 2004. See, also, the web pages: www.thebritishmuseum.ac.uk/iraqcrisis/index.html;
cctr.umkc.edu/user/fdeblauwe/iraq.html;
www.interpol.int/Public/WorkOfArt/Default.asp;
www.mcdonald.cam.ac.uk/IARC/iarc/iraq.htm;
icom.museum/redlist;
oi.uchicago.edu/OI/IRAQ/Iraqdatabasehome.htm.

⁷ From 23 October 1991 through 6 December 1991, hundreds of shells fired by the JNA forces impacted in the Old Town area of the city. The Old Town of Dubrovnik was an UNESCO World Cultural Heritage Site in its entirety. A number of the buildings in the Old Town and the towers on the city walls were marked with the symbols mandated by the 1954 Hague Convention on the protection of cultural property in the event of armed conflict. See IPCM 1992; IPCM 1992a; Kaiser, von Imhoff 1995, *passim*; MDC. See, moreover, The International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia, case no. IT-01-42, *The Prosecutor of the Tribunal Against Miodrag Jokic*.

⁸ See Gallas 1990; AA.VV. 1999a; Demosthenous 2000; Bacci 2002, 191-204; Demosthenous 2002, 205-206.

⁹ See Martin 1992-93 and the web page <http://news.bahai.org/story.cfm?storyid=323>.

¹⁰ In April 2003 a military camp was first established at Babylon by American forces. In September 2003 command of the camp was handed over to Polish army. See Curtis 2004.

¹¹ E.g. in 1982, for unknown reasons, a Danish guided missile has completely destroyed a residential area in North Western Zealand; in the November of 2001 the Kabul offices of the Arab satellite al-Jazeera channel have been destroyed by a US missile; during the war against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, 5 NATO missiles accidentally fell down in Bulgaria.

¹² Hatch Dupree 1997-1998, 114-119; Maniscalco 2001, 8; Flandrin 2001, 205-211; Van Krieken Pieters 2002, 305-

- Vicinity to a military objective, armaments, etc.

The ongoing warfare of the past few years confirm that horrendous and criminal ballistic strategies are used by different factions in order to mutilate children, to execute mass rapes or to destroy the cultural heritage of the enemy. These strategies have been aimed, not only at destroying the enemy's future, but also in order to cancel every trace of its past.¹³

In order to deter future episodes of this kind of “cultural holocaust”, the protection of cultural property in conflict zones should be considered as an absolute priority, such as the respect of human rights. This, because it aims to preserve the roots and the identity of entire populations, as well as the conservation of their dignity and their pride. This is why a populace deprived of its own “history” cannot exist.

Violations of human rights and attacks against humanity and cultural and/or cultural property are recurrent in the Middle East,¹⁴ in Kosovo,¹⁵ in Iraq,¹⁶ in Afghanistan,¹⁷ etc.

2. The Risks for the cultural property in the event of armed conflict

The risks for the cultural patrimony in war areas can be "indirect" or "direct"¹⁸ (i.e. use of weapons against monuments, historical buildings and/or movable cultural heritage).¹⁹

2.1. “Indirect” risks

In time of peace the main risks for the cultural property are of mechanical, physical, biological-chemical and anthropical nature. In the areas of crisis these risks become more injurious and destructives.

2.1.1. Mechanical risks

Generally the mechanical damages to the cultural patrimony are the cause of:

- Activities of mobility and transport -engaged in the transfer and recovery of movable cultural property to refuges or to another nation- realized quickly, without a preventive planning and using inadequate tools and personnel.
- Works of fortification and/or protection of monuments realized by inexpert personnel, quickly and without a preventive planning.
- Reduction of the residual stability of an historical building and/or monument statically damaged by bombardments and/or weakened by the prolonged state of carelessness and of utter neglect. The decrement of the residual stability can be produced by:
 - o violent storms that cause wind- or waterstress,
 - o vibrations produced when heavy vehicles (e.g. tanks) pass in the proximity of historical buildings,
 - o earthquakes,
 - o landslides, avalanches, tsunami, etc.,
 - o weight of rain, snow or piroclastic deposit on the roofs.

2.1.2. Physical risks

316.

¹³ See Maniscalco forthcoming.

¹⁴ On the situation of the cultural patrimony in Palestine see Hamdan 2000, 213-228; Piccirillo 2002, 271-276; Taha 2002, 265-269; Maniscalco 2004, 76-81; Maniscalco 2005 (with bibliography).

¹⁵ See AA.VV. 1999; Maniscalco 2002a; Maniscalco 2002c, 156-158. See, also, the web pages www.spc.yu/Vesti-2004/pogrom.html and www.salvaimonasteri.org.

¹⁶ See, *supra*, note 6.

¹⁷ See Hatch Dupree 1996, 42-52; Hatch Dupree 1998; Hatch Dupree 1998a, 33-51; Flandrin 2001; Hatch Dupree 2002, 291-302; Van Krieken Pieters 2002, 305-316.

¹⁸ Maniscalco, Mengozzi 2002, 73-82.

¹⁹ About the risks for the cultural patrimony see Maniscalco forthcoming.

The physical risks for the monuments and/or historical buildings damaged by bombardments and lacking in roofings, doors and/or windows, derive especially from:

- Water infiltrations and humidity. In war areas, because of bombardments and/or of carelessness and/or of utter, the risks of water infiltrations and of humidity for the immovable cultural patrimony are increased by cracks in the external walls, by demolition of roofs, doors and windows, by water pipelines rupture or by sewers breakage, etc. During last war in Iraq, for example, the bombardments have caused the flood of the vault below the Central Bank in Baghdad, where precious collections from the Archaeological Museum of Baghdad were deposited. The decisive role water plays in the deterioration of historical buildings is well-known and widely documented. Therefore, characterizing the different types of moisture transport involved (water absorption by capillarity and immersion, water vapour absorption or hygroscopy, and drying behaviour) is relevant for studies of the alteration of porous material.²⁰
- Thermal variations. The thermal variations can contribute to the deterioration of cultural patrimony by means of freeze-thaw action and of sudden change of temperature.²¹
- Light. Long or regular exposure to artificial or natural light may cause irreversible damage to objects. This damage may manifest itself as discoloration or fading, or result in a change of a mechanical nature (brittleness, etc.). Depending on their chemical composition, physical structure, history or climatic environment artefacts may exhibit very different reactions to light exposure. Objects may be grouped into three categories according to their vulnerability to light: low sensitivity (stones, metals, ceramics, etc.), moderate sensitivity (wood, polychrome sculptures, oil paintings, tempera, bone, ivory) and high sensitivity (textiles, leather, graphic documents, colour photographs, etc.).²²
- Pollution. Pollution is the change of air and/or water chemical composition, caused or by the unbalance of its constitution elements, or by the presence of strange chemical elements, which can be prejudicial for the environment's balance and consequently for human's health and for the conservation of cultural property. From time immemorial war has involved not only human conflict but also environmental destruction in the forms of both "collateral damage" and deliberate destruction of environments.²³ So, for example, during the war in Vietnam, the destruction of forest ecosystems with broad-leaf herbicides has directly impacted not only the ecosystems in which they were used, but also has had long-term effects on human health. Instead, since the Persian Gulf War ("Desert Storm" 1991), the indiscriminate use of weapons containing depleted uranium has contaminated various nations (i.e. Iraq, Kuwait, Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and Afghanistan).²⁴ Moreover, frequently oil wells and/or petrochemical complexes are bombarded or set on fire (e.g. the petrochemical complexes in Yugoslavia, near Novi Sad and Pancëvo, or the Iraq's or Nigeria's oil wells). Naturally, besides the serious damage to the human and natural environment, the effects of pollution (e.g. acid rain or diminution of the ozone flayer) also constitute serious dangerous for the humanity's cultural heritage.

²⁰ Essential bibliography: Plenderleith, Philippot, 1960, 202-289; MacLeod, 1978; AA.VV. 1982, 17-54; Ferrara, Gelsomino 1988; Collombet 1989; AA.VV. 1993a; ICR 1994; Asti 1996; Mandrioli, Caneva 1998; Aveta 1996; AA.VV. 1999c; D'Orazio 1999; AA.VV. 2000; Nicchiarelli, Rocchi, Turlò 2000; Salemi 2000; Coquillat, Grelat 2002; AA.VV. 2003c, 46-53; Mandrioli, Caneva, Sabbioni 2003. Moreover, see the journal "Aerobiologia. International Journal of Aerobiology" - including the online journal "Physical Aerobiology".

²¹ See MBAC 2001 168-171.

²² AA.VV. 1982, 6-16.

²³ About environmental hazards of war see Westing 1990; McKinnon, Vine 1991; Ramachandran 1991; Hawley 1992; Lanier-Graham 1993; Gamble, Ruiz-Roque 1995; Schmitt 1995-96, 237-271; Centner 1996, 71-76; Grunawalt, King, McClain 1996; Notar 1996, 101-103; Schwartz 1998, 483-496.

²⁴ About uranium and archaeology see Maniscalco forthcoming.

- Fires.²⁵ In time of peace, the causes of fire accidents in monuments and/or in historical buildings are various (e.g. electrical problems, cigarettes improperly discarded or abandoned and ignite, burning candles left unattended in the Churches, repairs works, etc.). Monuments and historic buildings are often most at risk of fire during the wars, because of employment of flammable weapons (i.e. tracer bullets, incendiary bombs, fuel air explosives, etc.) and of new war strategies (e.g. vandalism and/or destruction of the Serbian-Orthodox shrines in Kosovo).²⁶

2.1.3. Biodeterioration

Since the middle of the 19th century, deterioration of cultural property due to environmental agents (lichens, bacteria or algae) was recognized and efforts at control initiated. The risks of biodeterioration of cultural property in war areas are numerous because it is impossible to assure the ordinary maintenance of historic buildings and of monuments.²⁷

2.1.4. Anthropical risks

In war areas the risks deriving from the anthropical activities are:

- improper use of monuments for strategic purposes -e.g. the Archaeological Museum of Priština,²⁸ or the Malwiya minaret in Samarra²⁹;
- neglect of building maintenance;
- logistic transformation and improper use of monuments for military purposes -e.g. the “Azykh Cave” in Azerbaijan³⁰ or the heavy equipment, helicopters and other machinery used by US and Polish Forces based at the Babylon site³¹;
- improper use or destruction of cultural property for ideological reasons -e.g. China's cultural genocide in Tibet, Hoxha's policy to annihilate the cultural property in Albania³² or Taliban destruction of the Bamiyan Buddha statues³³;
- vandalism against enemy's symbols and culture -e.g. the destruction of Orthodox shrines in Kosovo;³⁴
- illegal building or demolitions inside or near immovable cultural property -e.g. the illegal buildings near the roman amphitheatre of Durrës;³⁵
- wrong postwar restauration and/or improper consolidation which have been made with inadequate techniques, erroneous methodologies and/or with wrong means³⁶ -

²⁵ See D'Errico, Migliardini 2002, 97-107; Watts, Kaplan 2001, 165-178; Watts, Kaplan 2000; Stovel 1998, 43-55; Peterson, Sawyer 1998; AA.VV. 1997.

²⁶ See, *supra*, note 15.

²⁷ In general, about biodeterioration, see: Caneva, Nugari, Salvatori 2005; AA.VV. 2004, 325-336; Sánchez Hernampérez 2004; AA.VV. 2003b; Allsopp, Seal, Gaylarde 2003; Mandrioli, Caneva, Sabbioni 2003; Saiz-Jimenez 2003; Roquebert 2002; Ciferri, Tiano, Mastromei 2000; AA.VV. 1999b; AA.VV. 1995b; Garg, Garg, Mukerji 1994; AA.VV. 1993; Cumberland 1991; Agrawal 1985; Kraemer Koelier 1960; Greathouse, Wessel 1954; Kieslinger.

²⁸ During the war in Kosovo the roof of the Museum was used to place the anti-aircraft artillery.

²⁹ During the last war in Iraq, US army snipers have been positioned at the top of the great minaret (Malwiya) in Samarra -the world-famous spiral minaret of the Mosque of al-Mutawakkil (built in 849/852). Naturally, use of such monument for military purposes was considered an insult to Muslims and, perhaps, because of such desecration, the minaret was damaged from rockets firing by unidentified Islamics.

³⁰ It was transformed into an ammunition warehouse. See *Report on the results of Armenian aggression against Azerbaijan and recent developments in the occupied Azerbaijani territories*, United Nations A/58/594-S/2003/1090.

³¹ See, *supra*, note 10.

³² Maniscalco 1998; Maniscalco 2002d, 169-171.

³³ See, *supra*, note 12.

³⁴ See, *supra*, note 15.

³⁵ Maniscalco 1998, 52-58.

³⁶ The problem of damaging of immobile cultural heritage due to post war restorations is well documented. On this theme see Maniscalco 2000, *passim*; Maniscalco 2002, 154 and Maniscalco forthcoming.

e.g. the Gazi Husrev Bey Mosque of Sarajevo,³⁷ the Gazi Ali Bey Mosque of Vučitrn and the Hammam Mosque of Peć³⁸.

2.2. Direct Risks

In war areas the main risks for the cultural heritage derive from the intentional use of weapons against archaeological, artistic, architectural and historical symbols of the enemy.³⁹ So it would be useful to know the characteristics of the weapons, used by the different armies operating in the areas of crisis, with the aim to decide on suitable procedures for the preventive protection or for the reduction of damages to the international cultural property.⁴⁰

The main risks derive from explosives and, in particular, from bombs.

Bombs are explosive fillers enclosed in a casing and generally are classified according to the *ratio* of explosive material to total weight. The principal classes of bombs are General-Purpose (GP), Fragmentation, Penetration and Cluster bombs. Approximately 50% of the General Purpose bomb's weight is explosive material. These bombs weigh between 200 and further 9.800 kilograms and produce a combination of blast and fragmentation effects. At moment, the most power GP, used during the wars in Afghanistan and in Iraq, is the GBU-43/B⁴¹ that contains more than 8.400 kilograms of high explosive. Only 10 to 20% of a Fragmentation bomb's weight is explosive material; the remainder includes specially scored cases that break into predictably sized pieces. The fragments, which travel at high velocities, are the primary cause of damage. Penetration bombs have between 25 and 30% explosive filler. The casings are designed to penetrate hardened targets such as bunkers before the explosives detonate. Penetration is achieved by either kinetic energy of the entire projectile or the effects of a shaped-charge.⁴² Cluster bombs are primarily fragmentation weapons.⁴³ Cluster bombs, like GP bombs, can feature mix and match components (submunitions, fuzes, etc.) to produce the desired effect.

During the last international conflicts it has been emphasized the power and the precision of the new generation of sophisticated weapons (rockets and, especially, missiles). Before the wars in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and in Iraq, the Coalition Forces have repeatedly declared that they would use accurately guided "intelligent" bombs against Serbian and Iraqi military targets, so as to avoid, as far as possible, accidents hurting the civilians, and tried their utmost to spread the myth that the Iraq War would create the wonder in human history about "the use of accurate guide weapons to avoid humanitarian disasters". However, it is well know that frequently because of the human errors, of the causality and/or of the destructive power of the weapons employed, civilian settlements, cultural monuments, etc. were "wrongly hit".

Moreover, during aerial attacks, bombers can cover a large area with traditional or cluster bombs; but they not have precision guidance, because bombs, dropped from medium to high altitudes, they can wander off target and hit civilian settlements or cultural monuments.

Also individual and crew-served weapons can be destructive when used against movable and immovable cultural heritage (e.g. a great quantity of ogives can slowly erode, burn and ruin even a wall of great thickness).⁴⁴

³⁷ Maniscalco 1997, 48-51.

³⁸ Maniscalco 2000a, 20 and 30-31.

³⁹ About the "direct risks" for the cultural heritage in the event of armed conflict see Maniscalco forthcoming; Maniscalco, Mengozzi 2002, 73-82; Smith 1996; AA.VV. 1995.

⁴⁰ See Maniscalco forthcoming.

⁴¹ So called Mother of All Bombs (MOAB).

⁴² Penetration and Thermobaric Weapons were widely used, during the Operation "Enduring Freedom" in Afghanistan, with the aim to destroy Taliban tunnels and/or bunkers.

⁴³ Widely used in the Former Yugoslavia and in Afghanistan, cluster bombs are vehemently denounced by human rights organizations, because cluster bombs have the same deadly effects of the anti-personnel mines, which are outlawed by the *Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction*, December 1997, Ottawa.

⁴⁴ Maniscalco forthcoming.

Naturally, considering the treacherous destruction of the Bamiyan Buddhas or of the Orthodox churches of Kosovo it is useful to remind that it is very difficult to prevent and to combat the cultural terrorism without a Legislative and Executive Body, in the international juridical system, able to codify and to apply rules that are valid and have characteristics of generality and universality⁴⁵ (Figs 6-7).

2.3. Main Damages to cultural property

As above mentioned, in war areas the cultural patrimony is threatened by the intentional use of weapons. Damage resulting from the event of armed conflict, depending on the nature of the armaments employed and on the possibilities of secondary damages linked to the conflict.⁴⁶

1. **Immovable cultural property.** Structures and building materials of the monuments, in conflict areas suffered not only from the normal deterioration process, caused by the physical environment and by lack of maintenance, but especially from structural failures caused by shelling and bombs. The main types of damages to immovable cultural patrimony in war areas are the following:

- Blast. Most damage to buildings and other structures from an explosion results from the effects of blast: the high-pressure pulse, or shock wave, that moves rapidly outward from the exploding bomb. Damage is caused both by the overpressure of the air at the front of the blast wave and by the strong winds after the wave front has passed (Fig. 8).
- Fragments. Fragments (of bombs, windows glass and other objects) produced by an explosion, which travel at high velocities, are one of the primary cause of damage to movable cultural property, but also to frescoes, to architectonic and artistic decorations.
- Fire high temperatures. Higher temperatures during fires (produced by incendiary bombs, tracer bullets, vandalism, etc.) may affect structural strength of historic buildings or monuments. In fact, structural steel members can lose strength when heated to high temperatures; moreover, higher temperatures can cause deflection and buckling of thin walls.
- Use of mechanical means (excavators, bulldozer, etc.) against cultural property. For example, in the past few years the Israeli army has been using bulldozers and excavators to defeat the guerrilla groups. In this way, numerous cultural monuments have been razed completely to the ground.⁴⁷
- Effects of violent storms, that cause wind- or waterstress, and/or vibrations produced by heavy vehicles and/or by earthquakes on monuments statically damaged by bombardments and/or weakened by the prolonged state of carelessness and of utter neglect.
- Reduction of the residual stability of an historical building because of illicit buildings -e.g. raisings, armour platings, etc.
- Water infiltrations because of bombardments and/or of carelessness and/or of utter.
- Wall erosion because of great quantity of ogives used during the conflict.

2. **Movable cultural patrimony.** The main types of damages and/or risks to movable cultural property in war areas are the following:

- Blast. The shock wave tears and damages or destroys paintings, sculptures, and/or movable cultural items because of the overpressure of the air at the front of the blast wave and of the strong winds after the wave front has passed.

⁴⁵ Maniscalco 2005, 38-41.

⁴⁶ See Maniscalco forthcoming.

⁴⁷ Maniscalco 2005, *passim*.

- Fragments. Fragments (of bombs, windows glass and other objects) produced by an explosion, which travel at high velocities, can become “bullets” against paintings, sculptures, etc.
- Fire high temperatures.
- Vandalism.
- Water infiltrations and humidity.
- Looting and art theft crimes.⁴⁸

3. Main international instruments for the protection of cultural property

The First normative provisions for the protection of international cultural property in war areas go back to the XIX century. One thinks, for example, of the Italian *Regolamento di servizio per le truppe in campagna* of 1833 or of the “Lieber Code” of 1863.

Lacking of legally binding value, because no State ratified them, were the “Brussels Declaration” of 1874⁴⁹ and the “Oxford Manuals” of 1880⁵⁰ and of 1913.⁵¹

The “Brussels Declaration”, *ex* article 17, reiterated the principles of the “Lieber Code”:

«[...] toutes les mesures nécessaires doivent être prises pour épargner, autant qu'il est possible, les édifices consacrés aux cultes, aux arts, aux sciences et à la bienfaisance, les hôpitaux et les lieux de rassemblement de malades et de blessés, à condition qu'ils ne soient pas employés en même temps à un but militaire. Le devoir des assiégés est de désigner ces édifices par des signes visibles spéciaux à indiquer d'avance à l'assiégeant».⁵²

Therefore, the “Brussels Declaration” imposed also a duty on the besieged to indicate the presence of such buildings by distinctive and visible signs to be communicated to the enemy before hand.⁵³

The “Manuals of Oxford” provided, in the case of bombardment, for to spare the buildings dedicated to religion, art and science.⁵⁴ Moreover, in the Manual of 1880 it was provided some norms⁵⁵ that inspired the Italian *Regolamento di servizio in Guerra* (1881-1882)⁵⁶ and the *Laws and*

⁴⁸ About looting and art theft crimes see Fales 2004; AA.VV. 2003; ICOM 2003; Brodie, Tubb 2002; Conforti, Maniscalco 2002, 121-133; Hatch Dupree 2002, 291-302; Maniscalco 2000; Maniscalco 1998, *passim*; Askerud, Clément 1997; ICOM 1997; ICOM 1997a; ICOM 1997b; Oyediran 1997; Atti 1994; Bourguignon, Choppin 1994; Gallas 1990, 28-35.

⁴⁹ *Déclaration de Bruxelles de 1874 concernant les lois et les coutumes de la guerre*, 27 August 1874. See Actes de la Conférence de Bruxelles, Bruxelles, 1874, F. Hayez, 297-305 and 307-308. See, also, de Breucker 1974.

⁵⁰ *The Laws of War on Land*, adopted by the Institute of International Law, Oxford, 9 September 1880.

⁵¹ *Manual of the Laws of Naval War*, adopted by the International Institute of International Law, Oxford, 9 August 1913.

⁵² See G. Rolin-Jaequemyns, *Examen de la Déclaration de Bruxelles de 1874*, Institut de Droit International, 30 August 1875, rapport.

⁵³ P. Verri, *The condition of cultural property in armed conflicts: From Antiquity to World War II*, in “International Review of the Red Cross” 246, 1985, 129.

⁵⁴ *The Laws of War on Land*, article 34: « In case of bombardment all necessary steps must be taken to spare, if it can be done, buildings dedicated to religion, art, science and charitable purposes, hospitals and places where the sick and wounded are gathered on the condition that they are not being utilized at the time, directly or indirectly, for defense. It is the duty of the besieged to indicate the presence of such buildings by visible signs notified to the assailant beforehand». *Manual of the Laws of Naval War*, article 28: «In bombardments all useless destruction is forbidden, and especially should all necessary measures be taken by the commander of the attacking force to spare, as far as possible, sacred edifices, buildings used for artistic, scientific, or charitable purposes, historic monuments, hospitals, and places where the sick or wounded are collected. on condition that they are not used at the same time for military purposes».

⁵⁵ Art. 53: « The property of municipalities, and that of institutions devoted to religion, charity, education, art and science, cannot be seized.

All destruction or wilful damage to institutions of this character, historic monuments, archives, Works of art, or science, is formally forbidden, save when urgently demanded by military necessity.

(b) Private property

If the powers of the occupant are limited with respect to the property of the enemy State, with greater reason are they limited with respect to the property of individuals.»

⁵⁶ See Marcheggiano 1989, 823-834.

Customs of War on Land.⁵⁷ In particular, the Conventions done at the Hague, agreed upon the following provisions:⁵⁸

- to spare, in sieges and bombardments, as far as possible, buildings dedicated to religion, art, etc. or historic monuments;
- to indicate the presence of buildings dedicated to religion, art, etc. or historic monuments by distinctive and visible signs, which shall be notified to the enemy beforehand;
- to prohibit the destruction or the seizure of the enemy's property, unless such destruction or seizure be imperatively demanded by the necessities of war;
- to prosecute legally all seizure or destruction or wilful damage done to historic monuments, works of art and science.

Because of the development of air bombardment during the First World War, the “Conference on the Limitation of Armament”, convened in 1922, mandated a Commission of jurists to draft rules on air warfare. The Commission drew up a set of rules, aimed at restricting air bombardment to military objectives;⁵⁹ but unfortunately, also these rules were never ratified.

So, up to the adoption of the 1954 “Hague Convention for the protection of cultural property in the event of armed conflict”, only the so-called “Roerich Pact” -a regional treaty- had legal value, but only among the United States of America and the Other American Republics.

The Hague Convention of 1954⁶⁰ is until now the main multilateral juridical tool, dedicated to the protection of cultural property in the event of armed conflict, although the cultural protection provisions of the 1977 Additional Geneva Protocols⁶¹ and of the 1999 Second Protocol to the Hague Convention of 1954 for the protection of cultural property in the event of armed conflict.⁶²

⁵⁷ *Convention with Respect to the Laws and Customs of War on Land* (Hague II, 29 July 1899); *Convention (IV) respecting the Laws and Customs of War on Land* and its annex *Regulations concerning the Laws and Customs of War on Land* (The Hague, 18 October 1907). In the Convention of 1907 it was included almost all the text of the Hague II Convention.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*

⁵⁹ *Rules concerning the control of wireless telegraphy in time of war and air warfare* drafted by a commission of jurists tasked with studying and reporting on the revision of the laws of war, which met at The Hague between 11 December 1922 and 19 February 1923. See “American Journal of International Law”, 17, 1923, Supplement, 245-60; “American Journal of International Law”, 32, 1938, Supplement, 1-56; ICRC website www.icrc.org/IHL.

⁶⁰ Hague Convention 1954-1999.

⁶¹ See Protocol Additional to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949, and relating to the Protection of Victims of International Armed Conflicts (Protocol I), adopted on 8 June 1977, art. 53 : «Without prejudice to the provisions of the Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict of 14 May 1954, and of other relevant international instruments, it is prohibited:

(a) To commit any acts of hostility directed against the historic monuments, works of art or places of worship which constitute the cultural or spiritual heritage of peoples;

(b) To use such objects in support of the military effort;

(c) To make such objects the object of reprisals.» and

Art. 83, 4 (d): «...Making the clearly-recognized historic monuments, works of art or places of worship which constitute the cultural or spiritual heritage of peoples and to which special protection has been given by special arrangement, for example, within the framework of a competent international organization, the object of attack, causing as a result extensive destruction thereof, where there is no evidence of the violation by the adverse Party of Article 53, sub-paragraph (b), and when such historic monuments, works of art and places of worship are not located in the immediate proximity of military objectives».

See, also, Protocol Additional to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949, and Relating to the Protection of Victims of Non-International Armed Conflicts (Protocol II), adopted on 8 June 1977, art. 16: «Without prejudice to the provisions of The Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict of 14 May 1954, it is prohibited to commit any acts of hostility directed against historic monuments, works of art or places of worship which constitute the cultural or spiritual heritage of peoples, and to use them in support of the military effort.»

⁶² The Hague, 26 March 1999. The Second Protocol was adopted with the aim to fill the gaps of the 1954 Hague Conventions. See Hague Convention 1954-1999; Leanza 2002, 25-40; Boylan 2002, 41-52.

About the 1954 Hague Convention there is a wide bibliography;⁶³ therefore in the present paragraph I will analyze the general principles and the main gaps of this treaty and I will emphasize the main violation of the Convention's rules.⁶⁴

Precisely because it was drawn up in the aftermath of the Second World War, the 1954 Hague Convention was written with almost exclusive object of the protection of cultural heritage during an international conflict. It is for this reason that the current inadequacy of global legislation has to be seen as one of the main causes of the corruption of historical, artistic and architectural property of nation in crisis.⁶⁵

It is well known that cultural patrimony often becomes the target for extremists and/or separatists and/or criminals with the aim of destabilising governments or diverting the attention of forces of order.⁶⁶ Seeing as it is only a short step from terrorism to civil war, it is fundamental not only to extend the contents of the Hague Convention to include non-international conflicts, but also to include (for nations where there is a higher incidence or risk of terrorism) measures aimed at preventing and limiting the damage that can be caused by attacks, as well as making more severe the penalties for those guilty of damaging cultural heritage.

Article 3 of the 1954 Hague Convention states that signatories "*undertake to prepare in time of peace for the safeguarding of cultural property situated within their own territory against the foreseeable effects of an armed conflict, by taking such measures as they consider appropriate*". So, article 3 do not "oblige", but "binds" contracting parties to take measures in peacetime to ensure the safeguarding of their own cultural heritage in case of armed conflict. In this way, paradoxically, unlike countries such as Italy, France or Spain, States with less cultural or historical wealth - Switzerland or Belgium, for example- have enacted a large part of the measures required by the Convention. Bunkers in which to store items in case of danger have been constructed, for example, and signs of Convention have been placed on monumental buildings⁶⁷ (Fig. 9).

Article 4 of the Hague Convention states that the Contracting Parties should abstain from reprisals or direct attacks against the cultural heritage of another State and that they should not use their own cultural heritage or that of others in ways which could expose it to destruction or deterioration in case of an armed conflict. Despite this, clause 2 of the same article allows derogation of the strictures described in the first section in case of "military necessity".

In this way terrible acts, such as the destructions of the bridge of Mostar -during the conflict in the former Yugoslavia- or of the town of Hué -during the Vietnam war-, or such as the bombardments in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, in Iraq or in Afghanistan can be easily justified.⁶⁸

During an armed conflict protected cultural heritage must display a distinctive sign and be accessible to any eventual international checking, as stated in the "Regulation for the execution of the Convention for the protection of Cultural property in the event of armed conflict".⁶⁹ Under article 9 immunity should be guaranteed by the signatories, who should also take measures to ensure that the item in question is not open acts of hostility and not used for military purposes.⁷⁰

This article, then, does not impose any necessity of safeguarding cultural heritage by the civil police force or military forces from belligerent states, nor does it require any vigilance or attempt to prevent theft by military personnel, irregular troops or civilians on their part. It only simplistically talks about respect for and abstention from illicit acts on the part of ratifying nations. Consequently

⁶³ Nahlik 1967, 61-163; Boylan 1993; Panzera 1993; Clément 1994, 11-25; Toman 1994; UNESCO 1995; Stavradi 1996; Maniscalco 1999; Boylan 2002, 41-52; Gioia 2002, 11-23.

⁶⁴ About violations to the Convention's rules see Boylan 1993, *passim*; Maniscalco 1999, *passim*; Maniscalco 2002a, 149-153; Maniscalco 2005a, 25-37.

⁶⁵ Nahlik 1974, 100-108; Boylan 1993, *passim*; Maniscalco 1999, *passim*.

⁶⁶ For example, in May 1993 the Gallery of Uffizi was badly damaged when a stolen van packed with 200 kg of explosives blew up on a street behind the 400-year-old gallery in Florence. See AA.VV. 1995c; AA.VV. 2003d.

⁶⁷ Maniscalco 1999, 27-28.

⁶⁸ Maniscalco 1999, 29-30.

⁶⁹ About the Affixing of the emblem see Article 20 of the Regulation Act.

⁷⁰ Maniscalco 1999, 34.

in war areas theft, pillage and illegal trafficking of archaeological material destined for the international market is common. This phenomenon is known as “archeomafia”,⁷¹ it is made possible by a series of different factors. Firstly, because international treaties are not adequate for the tutelage of cultural heritage and because in war areas it is very difficult to control the state of the archaeological and cultural sites. Secondly, in areas of crisis the poverty struck population is forced to survive in one way or the other; for this reason, for example, the rubble of the Buddha, which were blown up by the Taliban authorities in Afghanistan, have been offered for sale.⁷²

Article 7 of the 1954 Hague Convention is unique in that it specifically describes measures of military order for the care of cultural heritage in periods of crisis.⁷³

An early attempt to use qualified military personnel took place at the beginning of 1996, when I took part in the Implementation Force monitoring mission to Sarajevo (IFOR) in Bosnia and Herzegovina, albeit I was unaccompanied and without resources.⁷⁴ Thanks to the positive results of this experience, in 1997, I organized, with the NATO Forces in Albania, an experimental team for protection of cultural heritage in crisis areas.⁷⁵ Despite the success of this monitoring mission, the Italian and the NATO Forces⁷⁶ displayed utter indifference to the 1954 Hague Convention itself. In the 1999 mission to Kosovo (KFOR), for example, the possibility of setting up a new protection team was not even taken into consideration, and not even during the Multinational operations in Afghanistan and in Iraq was employed military personnel specialized in the protection of cultural patrimony.⁷⁷ Instead, as experiences in Bosnia and in Albania have demonstrated, the presence of specialised personnel should be of considerable importance and undoubted use for the various tasks at hand: supervising and collaborating with any necessary transportation to safe deposits, prevent the illegal excavation and/or uncontrolled export of cultural property, checking that the military personnel themselves are not responsible for any theft from the country in which they are operating and producing (whatever the outlook) measures aimed at dealing with any possible problems arising in the field. At home, on the other hand, such a person could be used for preventing and limiting damage caused by natural disasters, working alongside the relevant authorities in aid operations and preserving the cultural heritage of towns and cities affected by destruction, theft and looting.

With regard to the identification of cultural heritage, already in the First Geneva Convention of 1864 regarding the norms regulating the protection of victims of war, the Red Cross was created and its universal emblem was used to distinguish the neutrality of all types of sanitary structure. The same symbol has become the emblem of the most important international humanitarian organization. Even though the protection of cultural heritage is part of international humanitarian law, the question of distinguishing and identifying cultural property under tutelage in times of war, has never been considered as a priority.

On the other hand, the treaties following the Regulation on laws and use of warfare attached to the IV Hague Convention of 1907,⁷⁸ different symbols have been presented one by one. The latest

⁷¹ On the phenomenon of “archeomafia” see Maniscalco 2000 (with bibliography) and Conforti, Maniscalco, 2002, 121-133.

⁷² See *Buddha rubble 'up for sale'*, in “BBC News”, 2 April, 2001; *Bamiyan Buddha Fragments for Sale*, in “Hindu”, 2 April 2001.

⁷³ See Danse 1963, 147-151; Maniscalco 1998a; Maniscalco 1998c, 134-138.

⁷⁴ Maniscalco 1997.

⁷⁵ Maniscalco 1998.

⁷⁶ Exhibition and presentation *Experiences of protection of cultural patrimony in Bosnia-Herzegovina* (organized by Fabio Maniscalco and Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers Europe), “Shapex”, Shape (Mons) 1998. See, also, Maniscalco 1998a.

⁷⁷ Personnel of Italian Carabinieri Tutela Patrimonio Culturale, employed in Iraq during the last crisis, was not specialized in the protection of cultural property and in Italy works exclusively in the field of movable cultural property (theft, illegal traffic and/or falsification of art). Moreover, only two or three Carabinieri TPC were employed for each mission.

⁷⁸ Preceded by the 2nd Hague Convention 1899, *Laws and costumes on territorial warfare*. See Maniscalco 2005b, 97-99.

being contemplated in the 1954 Hague Convention on the protection of cultural patrimony in the event of armed conflict.

It foresees the so called “Blue Shield” emblem.⁷⁹ When it is displayed alone, the individuals and cultural property are under general protection. This means that the persons in charge of functions of control, the personnel designated for the tutelage of cultural property and the identity cards of the personnel are protected.⁸⁰

According to paragraph 1 of Art. 17, the emblem, when represented three times in a triangular formation with a symbol at the bottom, it indicates exclusively cultural property under special protection; included the transport of cultural property and improvised shelters.⁸¹

The norms on the use of the distinctive sign are outlined in Art. 20 of the Regulation Act of the 1954 Hague Convention. It is not binding for the ratifying States to use the sign already in times of peace, but only in the event of armed conflicts and on cultural property under special protection.

Also for this reason, during the conflicts after 1954, the emblem has only been used rarely for notifying the presence of cultural heritage.⁸²

Moreover, as it has happened in the Former Yugoslavia, the combatants have opened fire on the emblem itself, which was probably mistaken with one of the enemies's or one of the peace force's emblems.⁸³

Hence, the ignorance of the Blue Shield derives from the insufficient dissemination which could be guaranteed by making its use compulsory even in times of peace. The inadequate use also derives from the extremely expansive and complex modalities of its use. Confusion also derives from the existence of the distinctive sign for the different categories of protected cultural property.⁸⁴

If it is already difficult in peacetime to look after and conserve cultural heritage, protecting it from wear and tear, theft or vandalism, such difficulties clearly become even greater during a war.

Theft and looting of works of art have always sadly characterised armed conflict, from the Roman Conquests (when the *ius praedae* was even a recognized method of gaining property), to the Crusaders' sack of Constantinople, to the Napoleonic campaigns right through to the Second World War.⁸⁵

It was precisely to combat such actions that a Protocol separate from the Hague Convention was drawn up. According to this Protocol, amongst other things, each ratifying State agreed to impede the exportation of cultural heritage from a territory occupied by them, to sequester cultural heritage imported into such territory and coming directly or indirectly from any occupied region.

Even though many nations adhered to this Protocol and to the 1970 UNESCO Convention,⁸⁶ art theft continues throughout different nations and continents in time of conflict.

It seems clear that in order to protect the mobile cultural heritage of any state, as well as the need to revise legislation for the sector, it is also necessary to pre-arrange the transportation of movable cultural property contained in museums and public and private collections to safe places. In addition to this, it is fundamental to have a widespread graphic and photographic cataloguing system to make the retrieval of stolen works of art easier. It is difficult (often impossible) to recognise and identify stolen objects such as sculptures, archaeological artefacts, canvases, icons, frescoes, church ornamentation and so on precisely because once divided up, little known and taken out of their

⁷⁹ This symbol has been adopted also in the 2nd Additional Protocol of 1999 of the 1954 Hague Convention. See Carcione 1999, 121-130; Maniscalco 1999, 38-40; Maniscalco 2005b, 93-107.

⁸⁰ Art. 17, paragraph 2.

⁸¹ The transports though have to be effectuated as cited in articles 12 and 13 of the Convention.

⁸² See Maniscalco 1999, 38-40; Maniscalco 2002a, 149-153.

⁸³ See Maniscalco 1997, 80.

⁸⁴ Maniscalco 1999, 38-40.

⁸⁵ Wescher 1988.

⁸⁶ *Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property*, (done at Paris, 14 November 1970 and entry into force 24 April 1972). See the UNESCO web page www.unesco.org/culture/laws/1970/html_eng/page1.shtml and Askerud, Clement 1997.

original context, they become unrecognisable and difficult to put into context (i.e. the archaeological items from Afghanistan, Iraq, Nigeria, Albania, etc.).

The tangible losses of international cultural heritage in Cambodia, in the former Soviet Union, in the Balkan conflicts, in the Gulf wars, etc., highlighted a number of improvements to be addressed in the implementation of the Hague Convention. A review of the Convention was initiated in 1991 to draw up a new agreement to complement the Convention taking account of the experience gained from conflicts and the development of international humanitarian and cultural heritage protection law since 1954. Consequently, it was decided (during the Diplomatic Conference held at The Hague in March 1999) to adopt a new supplementary legal instrument to the 1954 Hague Convention on the protection of cultural property in the event of armed conflict in the form of an Additional Protocol (named the Second Protocol).⁸⁷

The Second Protocol does not replace the 1954 Hague Convention; it complements it. In fact the adoption of the Second Protocol has created two levels of protection, the basic level under the 1954 Hague Convention for its States Parties and the higher level of protection under the Second Protocol for its States Parties.⁸⁸

The most important innovations of the Second Protocol Convention concern the creation of a new category of enhanced protection for cultural heritage that is particularly important for humankind, enjoys proper legal and administrative protection at national level and is not used for military purposes; the creation of an Intergovernmental Committee mainly responsible for the monitoring of the implementation of the Convention and the Second Protocol and the prescription of specific sanctions for serious violations of cultural property and of the conditions in which individual criminal responsibility shall apply.⁸⁹

Naturally, it is clear that until the Hague Convention and the Second Protocol will be in force at the same time and, especially, until the States will be able to ratify one or the other legal instrument, their power will be limited.

4. Strategies for the protection of cultural patrimony in war areas

Strategies for protection of cultural property in the event of armed conflict must be prepared, since peace time, at state or regional levels in order to produce the correct conditions and to decide the appropriate means for preserving movable and immovable cultural heritages.⁹⁰

Naturally it is important to involve both the military and the civil world, since the time of peace with:

- Planning of operative strategies for the protection of movable cultural property (e.g. transfer and recovery of cultural items to refuges or to another nation; works of protection for historical buildings, monuments and/or cultural sites).
- Planning of materials, means and personnel to achieve the safeguard of cultural property in the event of armed conflict.
- Creation of national advisory Committee for the implement of the 1954 Hague Convention and/or of the 1999 Second Protocol to the 1954 Hague Convention.
- Organization of lessons or conferences and drawing up of guidelines or manuals for military personnel and for personnel employed to protect the cultural property.
- Placing the distinctive emblem of the 1954 Hague Convention (the “blue shield”) on the cultural property not under special protection.⁹¹

⁸⁷ The Second Protocol, entered into force on 9 March 2004, at moment is signed by 33 States. See, *supra*, note 62.

⁸⁸ Maniscalco 2005a, 28.

⁸⁹ “International Committee of the Blue Shield” (ICBS). See www.international.icomos.org/blue_shield.htm;
www.ifla.org/blueshield.htm; www.ica.org/news.php?pnewsid=54&plangue=eng;
http://icom.museum/icbs_requirements.html.

⁹⁰ Maniscalco forthcoming.

⁹¹ See 1954 Hague Convention, article 17, paragraph 2 (a).

- Identification of refuges in which to transport and to shelter movable cultural property in the event of armed conflict.
- Identification of significant monuments, refuges and/or immovable cultural property and entering them in the “Register of Cultural Property under Special Protection”.⁹²
- Placing the distinctive emblem of the 1954 Hague Convention (repeated three times) on the cultural property under special protection.⁹³
- Periodical training of military forces to work in collaboration with cultural heritage experts.
- Raising the awareness of the national public opinion and of the Armed Forces for the respect of its and others historical and cultural identity and to adopt any useful measure to observe the provision of international treaties about protection of cultural property.
- Encouraging the systematic inventorying and cataloguing (graphic and video-photographic) of movable and immovable cultural property.

During the armed conflict it is important especially:

- To ensure that designated refuges provide stable conditions for items storage.
- To transport and to shelter movable cultural property to refuges or to another nation.
- To carry out works on the fortification and protection of monuments.
- To organize regular inspections to control the conservation conditions of cultural items inside the refuges and to control activities of civilian and/or military personnel engaged in the protection of cultural property.
- To avoid the use of historic buildings or of monuments for military purposes (e.g. to hide weapons).
- To avoid the illicit traffic of cultural property checking military or civilian personnel in departure.

4.1. Mitigation of disasters and preventive protection of immovable cultural property

In the event of armed conflict, the main measures to prevent damages from explosions and/or use of weapons are:⁹⁴

- Identification of the more useful means, instruments and/or techniques of protection of movable and immovable cultural property in the event of armed conflict (activities of mobility and transport, fortification of buildings against explosions, wall shores, windows removal, etc.).
- Employment of specialized personnel of high qualification in areas of expertise such as engineering, restoration, archaeology, art history, biblioteconomy, etc.
- Thickening of external walls with thickness inferior to 50 cm.
- Fragmentation, of long corridors or passages, with “sand sacks” walls or brick walls. Fragmentation walls are very useful for reduce the effects of shock wave and for block the running of the shell splinters.
- Adoption of specific technical and planning measures which may be useful in the fire-prevention strategy -e.g. use of automatic fire-suppression systems, designed to rapidly identify and extinguish a developing fire, use of fire-resistent doors, application of intumescent paint, construction of barriers, distribution of a stratum (30 cm) of sand on the floor, etc.
- Keep roofs and gardens clear of flammable vegetation and/or materials.

5. Conclusions

⁹² See 1954 Hague Convention, article 8, and Regulation for the Execution of the Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict, articles 12-15.

⁹³ See 1954 Hague Convention, article 16, paragraph 2 and article 17, paragraph 1.

⁹⁴ See Maniscalco forthcoming.

Presently, a great part of the international cultural property is inadequately protected from rapidly changing social and economic conditions and even less protected from the effects of existing and potential natural and man-made hazards. Safeguarding the international cultural heritage from such risks is imperative because it is of great importance for all peoples of the world. Although legal, scientific and technological resources to protect the international cultural property exist, these resources are not always properly employed.

So, considering that movable and immovable cultural patrimony have suffered grave damages or destructions during recent armed conflicts (e.g. Cambodia, Former Yugoslavia, Afghanistan and Iraq) and that, by reason of the developments in the technique of warfare, world cultural heritages are in increasing danger of destruction, it is with good reason that the international political and scientific community must participate, dynamically and cooperatively, in their protection.

Naturally, in order that international law has a concrete effect in the safeguard of cultural heritage in the event of armed conflict, it would be necessary to ratify existing treaties by as many states as possible (especially those involved in armed conflicts i.e. the USA and the UK)⁹⁵ and to decree clear prescriptions concerning individual penal responsibilities and sanctions for the defaulting States.

Moreover, it is well known the failure of UNESCO's policy regarding the protection of cultural property in the event of armed conflict (i.e. the destruction of Bamiyan Buddhas in Afghanistan or of Iraqi cultural property). For this reason it would be necessary the creation of a legislative Body, in the international juridical system, able to codify rules that are valid and have characteristics of generality and universality.

⁹⁵ In fact, neither the USA nor the UK have become signatories to the 1954 Hague Convention or to the 1999 Second Protocol. But the UK Government publicly has announced its intention to ratify the 1954 Hague Convention and accede to both its Protocols on 14 May 2004, the 50th anniversary of the Convention (see www.culture.gov.uk/cgi-bin/MsmGo.exe?grab_id=136&page_id=1835776&query=hagueconvention&hiword=convention+CONVENTIONAL+CONVENTIONALLY+CONVENTIONS+CONVENT+hague).

Captions Figs. 1-8

- Fig. 1. Bombing of Monte Cassino in the World War II. The convent from the Est side later the bombardment.
- Fig. 2. Bombing of Dresden in World War II. More than 90% of the city centre was destroyed in a fire storm.
- Fig. 3. Mostar. The “Stari Most” destroyed by the Croatian Army in 1993.
- Fig. 4. Teheran, Demolition of the House of Mirza Abbas Nuri in June 2004.
- Fig. 5. Kabul. The Chihilstun Palace looted and destroyed during the years '90 of the last century.
- Fig. 6. Kosovo, Djacova. Library of Hadum Suleiman Efendi vandalized and destroyed by Serbians in the year 1999.
- Fig. 7. Kosovo, Priština. Church of St. Nicholas, vandalized and destroyed by UCK extremists.
- Fig. 8. Effects of the Blast (by Maniscalco, Mengozzi 2002).
- Fig. 9. The sign of the 1954 Hague Convention (so called “Blue Shield”).

Bibliography

- AA.VV. 1982 AA.VV., *La conservazione nei musei. Il controllo dell'illuminazione; il controllo del clima*, ICCROM, Istituto per i Beni Artistici, Culturali e Naturali della Regione Emilia-Romagna, Bologna 1982.
- AA.VV. 1992 AA.VV., *Mostar urbicide*, Zagreb, 1992.
- AA.VV. 1993 AA.VV., *Biodeterioration of cultural property. Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference, (Yokohama, Japan, October 5-8, 1992)*, Tokyo, 1993.
- AA.VV. 1993a AA.VV., *Manual de diagnosi: i tractament d'humitats*, Col·legi d'Aparelladors i Arquitectos Tecnicos de Barcelona, Barcelona, 1993.
- AA. VV. 1995 AA.VV., *Protecting Buildings from Bomb Damage: Transfer of Blast-Effects Mitigation Technologies from Military to Civilian Application*, Washington, 1995.
- AA.VV. 1995a AA.VV., *A Report on the Devastation of Cultural, Historical and Natural Heritage of the Republic/Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina (from April 5, 1992, until September 5, 1995)*, Sarajevo, 1995.
- AA.VV. 1995b AA.VV., *Biodeterioration of cultural property. Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on biodeterioration of cultural property, (Bangkok, Thailand, July 4-7, 1995)*, Bangkok, 1995.
- AA.VV. 1995c AA.VV., *Gli Uffizi. Studi e ricerche, 14. I restauri dell'attentato. Consuntivo 1993-1995*, Firenze, 1995.
- AA.VV. 1997 AA.VV., *Proceedings: International Conference on Performance-Based Codes and Fire Safety Design Methods*, Society of Fire Protection Engineers, Boston, 1997.
- AA.VV. 1999 AA.VV., *Crucified Kosovo Destroyed and Desecrated Serbian Orthodox Churches in Kosovo and Metohija (June-October 1999)*, Belgrade, 1999.
- AA.VV. 1999a AA.VV., *Cyprus: a Civilization Plundered*, Committee for the Protection of the Cultural Heritage of Cyprus, Nicosia, 1999.
- AA.VV. 1999b AA.VV., *Biodétérioration et désinfection des collections d'archives et de bibliothèques: Actes des deuxièmes Journées sur la conservation préventive, (Arles, 18 et 19 novembre 1996)*, Arles, 1999.
- AA.VV. 1999c AA.VV., *The ten agents of deterioration: 5. Temperature & 6. Relative humidity*, in "Natural Sciences Conservation Group Newsletter", 10, 1999.
- AA. VV. 2000 AA.VV., *La climatologie dans les archives et les bibliothèques. Actes des troisièmes journées sur la conservation préventive, (Arles, 2 et 3 décembre 1998)*, Centre Interrégional de Conservation du Livre, Arles, 2000.
- AA. VV. 2003a AA.VV., *Art Loss in Iraq*, in "IFAR Journal", 6, 1-2, 2003.
- AA.VV. 2003b AA.VV., *Art, biology, and conservation: biodeterioration of works of art*, New York, 2003.
- AA.VV. 2003c AA.VV., *Lo stato dell'arte: conservazione e restauro, confronto di esperienze, Primo Congresso Nazionale IGIIC, (Villa Gualino, Torino, 5-7 giugno 2003)*, Gruppo Italiano, International Institute for Conservation, Torino, 2003.

- AA.VV. 2003d AA.VV., *Uffizi: oltre la facciata. Il restauro degli edifici pubblici danneggiati dall'attentato di via dei Georgofili*, Firenze, 2003.
- AA.VV. 2004 K. F. Nielsen, G. Holm, L. P. Uttrup, P. A. Nielsen, *Mould growth on building materials under low water activities. Influence of humidity and temperature on fungal growth and secondary metabolism*, in "International Biodeterioration & Biodegradation", 54, 4, 2004, 325-336.
- Agrawal 1985 O.P. Agrawal, *Control of biodeterioration in museums*, New Delhi, 1985.
- Asti 1996 P. Asti, *Umidità e condense: la prevenzione, la diagnosi, il risanamento*, Milano, 1996.
- Atti 1994 AA.VV., *La circolazione illecita delle opere d'arte ad un anno dall'apertura delle frontiere europee. Atti del 1° Convegno Internazionale, (Roma 3-4 maggio 1994)*, C.do Carabinieri Tutela Patrimonio Artistico, Roma, 1994.
- Allsopp, Seal, Gaylarde 2003 D. Allsopp, K. J. Seal, C.C. Gaylarde, *Introduction to Biodeterioration*, Cambridge 2003 (2^a ed.).
- Askerud, Clement 1997 P. Askerud, E. Clement, *Preventing the Illicit Traffic in Cultural Property: A Resource Handbook for the Implementation of the 1970 UNESCO Convention*, Paris, 1997.
- Aveta 1996 A. Aveta, *Tecniche per il restauro: problemi di umidità negli edifici monumentali*, Napoli, 1996.
- Bacci 2002 M. Bacci, *Monumenti, simboli e barriere di Cipro*, in Maniscalco 2002, 191-204.
- Bloch 1979 H. Bloch, *The bombardment of Monte Cassino (February 14-16, 1944): A new appraisal*, Grottaferrata 1979.
- Böhmler 1964 R. Böhmler, *Monte Cassino*, Translated from the German by R. H. Steven, London, 1964.
- Bond 1994 H. L. Bond, *Inferno a Cassino: la battaglia per Roma*, Milano, 1994.
- Bourguignon, Choppin 1994 A. Bourguignon, J.E. Choppin, *L'art volé: enquête sur le vole et le trafic d'objets d'art*, Paris, 1994.
- Boylan 1993 P.J. Boylan, *Review of the Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property for the Protection in the Event of Armed Conflict, (The Hague Convention of 1954)*, Paris, UNESCO, 1993, Report ref. CLT-93/WS/12.
- Boylan 2002 P.J. Boylan, *The 1954 Hague Convention on the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict and its 1954 and 1999 Protocols*, in Maniscalco 2002, 41-52.
- Brodie, Tubb 2002 N. Brodie, K. Tubb (ed.), *Illicit Antiquities*, London - New York, 2002.
- Caneva, Nugari, Salvatori 2005 G. Caneva, M.O. Nugari, O. Salvatori, *La biologia vegetale per i beni culturali, vol. 1, Biodeterioramento e conservazione*, Firenze, 2005
- Carcione 1999 M. Carcione, *Il simbolo di protezione del Patrimonio culturale: una lacuna del Protocollo del 1999*, in M. Carcione (a cura di), *Uno Scudo Blu. Per la salvaguardia del patrimonio mondiale. Atti del III Convegno Internazionale sulla Protezione dei Beni Culturali nei conflitti armati (Padova, 19-20 marzo 1999)*, Milano, 1999, 121-130.

- Carcione, Marcheggiano 1998 M. Carcione, A. Marcheggiano (a cura di), *La protezione dei Beni culturali nei conflitti armati e nelle calamità. Atti del primo Congresso della Società Italiana per la Protezione dei Beni Culturali*, (Alessandria, 11-13 Aprile 1997), Milano, 1998.
- Centner 1996 C. Centner, *Environmental Warfare: Implications for Policymakers and War Planners*, "Strategic Review", 24, Spring 1996, 71-76.
- Ciferri, Tiano, Mastromei 2000 O. Ciferri, P. Tiano, G. Mastromei, *Of microbes and art: the role of microbial communities in the degradation and protection of cultural heritage*, New York, 2000.
- Clément 1994 E. Clément, *Some Recent Practical Experience in the Implementation of the 1954 Hague Convention*, in "International Journal of Cultural Property", 3, 1, 1994, 11-25.
- Collombet 1989 R. Collombet, *L'humidité des bâtiments anciens: causes et effets, diagnostic, remèdes*, Paris, 1989 (2^e ed.).
- Conforti, Maniscalco 2002 R. Conforti, F. Maniscalco, *La tutela dei beni culturali mobili in Italia: il problema dei furti d'arte*, in F. Maniscalco (ed.), *La tutela dei beni culturali in Italia*, collana monografica "Mediterraneum. Tutela e valorizzazione dei beni culturali ed ambientali", 1, Napoli, 121-133.
- Coquillat, Grelat 2002 A. Coquillat, A. Grelat, *Prévention des sinistres dus à l'humidité dans les bâtiments anciens*, Centre d'études du bâtiment et des travaux publics (CEBTP), Paris, 2002.
- Cumberland 1991 D.R. Cumberland, *Guidelines for the prevention and control of biodeterioration*, in "Collection Storage" 15, 4, 1991.
- Curtis 2004 J.E. Curtis, *Report on Meeting at Babylon 11th – 13th December 2004*, unpublished, The British Museum, 2004.
- Danse 1963 M. Danse, *Communication relative à la formation culturelle dans l'armée aérienne au regard des dispositions de l'article 7, 1 de la Convention du 14 mai 1954*, in AA.VV., *Congrès de Florence 1961. Recueil de la Société internationale de droit pénal militaire et de droit de la guerre*, vol. 2, Strasbourg 1963, 147-151.
- de Breucker 1974 J. de Breucker, *La déclaration de Bruxelles de 1874 concernant les lois et les coutumes de la guerre*, Bruxelles, 1974.
- de Breucker 1975 J. de Breucker, *La réserve des nécessités militaires dans la Convention de La Haye du 14 mai 1954 sur la protection des biens culturels*, in "Revue de Droit Pénal et de Droit de la Guerre", 14, 1975, 255-269.
- Demosthenous 2000 D. Demosthenous (ed.), *The Occupied Churches of Cyprus*, Nicosia, 2000.
- Demosthenous 2002 D. Demosthenous, *Evidence on the extent of the destruction resulting from the consequences of the 1974 Turkish invasion*, in Maniscalco 2002, 205-206.
- D'Errico, Migliardini 2002 A. D'Errico, F. Migliardini, *Prevenzione incendi negli edifici di interesse storico e artistico*, in F. Maniscalco (ed.), *La tutela dei beni culturali in Italia*, monographic collection "Mediterraneum. Tutela e valorizzazione dei beni culturali ed ambientali", Maniscalco 2002, 97-107.
- D'Orazio 1999 M. D'Orazio, *Gli intonaci e l'umidità: guida ai sistemi per difendersi*, Milano, 1999.

- Fales 2004 F.M. Fales, *Saccheggio in Mesopotamia. Il Museo di Baghdad dalla nascita dell'Iraq a oggi*, Udine, 2004.
- Ferrara, Gelsomino 1988 G. Ferrara, L. Gelsomino (eds.), *Umidità. Tecniche e prodotti per il risanamento*, Firenze, 1988.
- Flandrin 2001 P. Flandrin, *I tesori perduti dell'Afghanistan. Sulle tracce del patrimonio archeologico di una civiltà millenaria*, Milano, 2001.
- Gallas 1990 K. Gallas, *The Plundering of Byzantine North Cyprus*, in "Apollo", 132-341, 1990, 28-35.
- Gamble, Ruiz-Roque 1995 R. O. Gamble, O. Ruiz-Roque, *The Laws of Armed Conflict and Environmental Protection: Striking a Balance*, Springfield, 1995.
- Garg, Garg, Mukerji 1994 L.K. Garg, N. Garg, K.J. Mukerji (eds), *Recent advances in biodeterioration and biodegradation, Vol. I: Biodeterioration of cultural heritage*, Calcutta, 1994.
- Glenny 1992 M. Glenny, *The Fall of Yugoslavia: The Third Balkan War*, London, 1992.
- Greathouse, Wessel 1954 G. A. Greathouse, C.J. Wessel (eds.), *Deterioration of Materials, Causes and Preventive Techniques*, New York, 1954.
- Grunawalt, King, McClain 1996 R. J. Grunawalt, J.E. King, R.S. McClain (eds), *Protection of the Environment During Armed Conflict*, Newport, RI, Naval War College, 1996.
- Hague Convention, 1954 - 1999 *Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict (The Hague, 14 May 1954) and Second Protocol to the Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict (The Hague, 26 March 1999)*. Text in English the UNESCO web page www.unesco.org/culture/legalprotection/war/html_eng/index_en.shtml.
- Hamdan 2000 O. Hamdan, *Conservation of Architectural Heritage in Palestine*, in AA.VV., *Saving Cultural Heritage, Projects around the Mediterranean*, Hamburg, 2000, 213-228.
- Hatch Dupree 1996 N. Hatch Dupree, *Museum under Siege*, in "Archaeology", 49, 1996, 42-52.
- Hatch Dupree 1997-1998 N. Hatch Dupree, *Bamiyan Buddhas Endangered*, in "Indorokoko-kenkyu" [Indian Archaeological Studies], Rikkyo University, 19, 1997-1998, 114-119.
- Hatch Dupree 1998 N. Hatch Dupree, *Status of Afghanistan's Cultural Heritage*, "SPACH Library Series", 1, Peshawar, 1998.
- Hatch Dupree 1998a N. Hatch Dupree, *Cultural Heritage of Afghanistan in Crisis*, in "Journal of Asian Civilizations", Quaid-i-Azam University, Islamabad, 21, 2, 1998, 33-51.
- Hatch Dupree 2002 N. Hatch Dupree, *Assaults on the Afghan Cultural Heritage*, in *Maniscalco* 2002, 291-302.
- Hawley 1992 T.M., Hawley, *Against the Fires of Hell: The Environmental Disaster of the Gulf War*, New York, 1992.
- ICOM 1997 I.C.O.M., *Looting in Angkor*, Paris, 1997.
- ICOM 1997a I.C.O.M., *Looting in Africa*, Updated Reprint, Paris, 1997.
- ICOM 1997b I.C.O.M., *Looting in Latin America*, Paris, 1997.
- ICOM 2003 ICOM, *Emergency Red List of Iraqi Antiquities at Risk*, International Council of Museums, Paris, 2003.

- ICR 1994 ICR, *Normal - 41/93: misura ponderale di umidità in superfici murarie dipinte*, Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche, Istituto Centrale per il Restauro, Roma, 1994.
- IPCM 1992 Institute for Protection of Cultural Monuments, *War damages and destructions inflicted on the culture, monuments, sites and historical centers in Croatia (rapport préliminaire jusqu'au 2 avril 1992)*, Zagreb, 1992.
- IPCM 1992a Institute for Protection of Cultural Monuments, *War damage on cultural heritage in Croatia: damage and destruction in may and june 1992*, Zagreb, 1992.
- IPCS 1994 Institute for the Protection of Cultural-Historical Heritage, *Sarajevo, Destruction & War Damages of Cultural-Historical Heritage in Old Market Place in Sarajevo-Bascarsija*, Sarajevo, 1994.
- Irving 1965 D. Irving, *Apocalisse a Dresda: i bombardamenti del febbraio 1945*, Milano, 1965.
- Kaiser, von Imhoff 1995 C. Kaiser, H. C. von Imhoff, *Information report on war damage to the cultural heritage in Croatia and Bosnia Herzegovina*, Strasbourg, 1995.
- Kieslinger A. Kieslinger, *Les principaux facteurs d'altération des pierres a batir*, text on line www.icomos.org.
- Kraemer Koelier 1960 G. Kraemer Koelier, *Previsión y conservación de bibliotecas y archivos contra agentes bióticos, el fuego y factores climáticos*, Madrid, 1960.
- Lanier-Graham 1993 S.D.Lanier-Graham, *The Ecology of War: Environmental Impacts of Weaponry and Warfare*, New York, 1993.
- Lavachery, Noblecourt 1954 H. A. Lavachery, A. Noblecourt, *Les techniques de protection des biens culturels en cas de conflit armé*, Paris, 1954.
- Leanza 2002 U. Leanza, *Il II Protocollo aggiuntivo del 1999 alla Convenzione de L'Aja del 954 sulla protezione dei beni culturali in caso di conflitto armato*, in *Maniscalco 2002*, 25-40.
- Lévi-Strauss 2002 L. Lévi-Strauss, *The action of UNESCO in Bosnia and Herzegovina to restore respect and mutual understanding among local communities through the preservation of cultural heritage*, in *Maniscalco 2002*, 143-148.
- MacLeod 1978 K. J. MacLeod, *Relative Humidity: Its Importance, Measurement and Control in Museums*, in "Canadian Conservation Institute Technical Bulletin", 1, Ottawa, 1978.
- Mandrioli, Caneva 1998 P. Mandrioli, G. Caneva (eds.), *Aerobiologia e beni culturali: metodologie e tecniche di misura*, Firenze, 1998.
- Mandrioli, Caneva, Sabbioni 2003 P. Mandrioli, G. Caneva, C. Sabbioni, *Cultural heritage and aerobiology: methods and measurement techniques for biodeterioration monitoring*, New York, 2003.
- Maniscalco 1997 F. Maniscalco, *Sarajevo. Itinerari artistici perduti*, Napoli, 1997.
- Maniscalco 1998 F. Maniscalco, *Frammenti di storia venduta. I tesori di Albania [Art for sale. Albania's treasures]*, Napoli, 1998.
- Maniscalco 1998a F. Maniscalco, *Article 7 of the Hague Convention 1954: Survey of Cultural Property in Sarajevo*, Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers Europe, Shapex '98, Shape (Mons) 1998.
- Maniscalco 1998b F. Maniscalco, *Sarajevo. Itinerari artistici perduti*, in Carcione, Marcheggiano 1998, 40-45.

- Maniscalco 1998c F. Maniscalco, *L'articolo 7 della Convenzione de L'Aja del 1954: il rilevamento dei beni culturali a Sarajevo ed in Albania*, in *Atti del II Colloquio Internazionale "La Gestione del Patrimonio Culturale"*, (Viterbo 5-8 dicembre 1997), Roma, 1998, 134-138.
- Maniscalco 1999 F. Maniscalco, *Ius Praedae. La tutela dei beni culturali in guerra [Ius Praedae. The Protection of cultural patrimony in war]*, Napoli, 1999.
- Maniscalco 1999a F. Maniscalco, *La memoria perduta*, in "Archeologia Viva", genn.-febb., 1999, 82-85.
- Maniscalco 2000 F. Maniscalco, *Furti d'Autore*, Napoli, 2000.
- Maniscalco 2000a F. Maniscalco, *Kosovo e Metohija 1998-2000. Rapporto preliminare sulla situazione del patrimonio culturale [Kosovo and Metohija 1998-2000. Preliminar rapport on the situation of the cultural property]*, Napoli, 2000.
- Maniscalco 2001 F. Maniscalco, *Afghanistan e qualche riflessione*, in "Archeologia Viva", 87, magg.-giu., 2001, 8.
- Maniscalco 2002 F. Maniscalco (a cura di), *La tutela del patrimonio culturale in caso di conflitto*, collana monografica "Mediterraneum. Tutela e valorizzazione dei beni culturali ed ambientali", vol. 2, Napoli 2002.
- Maniscalco 2002a F. Maniscalco, *Lacune e disattenzioni alla Convenzione de L'Aja del 1954 in un decennio di conflitti nella Penisola Balcanica*, in Maniscalco 2002, 149-153.
- Maniscalco 2002b F. Maniscalco, *Afghanistan: il saccheggio continua*, in "Archeologia Viva", 92, mar.-apr. 2002, 7.
- Maniscalco 2002c F. Maniscalco, *Kosovo: the destroyed memory*, in Maniscalco 2002, 156-158.
- Maniscalco 2002d F. Maniscalco, *La situazione dei beni culturali albanesi da Enver Hoxha alla crisi del 1997-1998*, in Maniscalco 2002, 169-171.
- Maniscalco 2003 F. Maniscalco, s.v., *Guerra*, in L. Marino (a cura di), *Dizionario di restauro archeologico*, Firenze, 2003, 107-109.
- Maniscalco 2003a F. Maniscalco, *Le rovine della Mesopotamia*, in "Archeologia Viva", 100, lug.-ago., 2003, 84-85.
- Maniscalco 2004 F. Maniscalco, *Good bye Palestina? Scudo blu per la memoria*, in "Archeologia Viva", 108, nov.-dic., 2004, 76-81.
- Maniscalco 2005 F. Maniscalco (ed.), *Tutela, conservazione e valorizzazione del patrimonio culturale della Palestina*, collana monografica "Mediterraneum. Tutela e valorizzazione dei beni culturali ed ambientali", vol. 5, Napoli, 2002.
- Maniscalco 2005a F. Maniscalco, *La Convenzione de L'Aja del 1954 e la crisi in Medio Oriente*, in Maniscalco 2005, 25-37.
- Maniscalco 2005b F. Maniscalco, *The "Blue Shield" Project. Practical Experiences Concerning thr Protection of Palestinian Cultural Property*, in Maniscalco 2005, 93-107.
- Maniscalco forthcoming F. Maniscalco, *Guidelines for the safeguard of cultural property in the event of armed conflict*, forthcoming
- Maniscalco, Mengozzi 2002 F. Maniscalco, G. Mengozzi, *I rischi "diretti" che minacciano i beni culturali in caso di conflitto armato*, in Maniscalco 2002, 73-82.

- Marcheggiano 1989 A. Marcheggiano, *La condizione dei beni culturali nei conflitti armati dall'Unità d'Italia agli anni Trenta*, in AA.VV., *Esercito e città dall'Unità d'Italia agli anni Trenta (Spoleto 11-14 maggio 1988)*, Deputazione di Storia Patria per l'Umbria, Perugia, 1989, 823-834.
- Marcheggiano 1991 A. Marcheggiano, *La protezione dei beni culturali in Diritto Umanitario e sua introduzione nella regolamentazione dell'esercito italiano*, vol. II, cap. VIII, SME-Uff. Storico, Roma, 1991.
- Marino 2001 L. Marino, *Nota sulle competenze dell'architetto restauratore nella conservazione di aree archeologiche e monumenti ridotti allo stato di rudere*, in C. Nenci (a cura di), *Restauro archeologico - Didattica e Ricerca 1997-1999*, Firenze, 2001.
- Marquis-Kyle, Walker 1992 P. Marquis-Kyle, M. Walker, *The Illustrated Burra Charter*, Australia ICOMOS Inc., 1992.
- Martin 1992-93 D. Martin, *The Case of the Bahá'í Minority in Iran*, in <http://bahai.org/article-1-8-3-7.html>.
- MBAC 2001 Ministero per i Beni e le Attività Culturali, *Atto di indirizzo sui criteri tecnico-scientifici e sugli standard di funzionamento e sviluppo dei musei. (Art. 150, comma 6, D.L. n. 112/1998)*, in "Gazzetta Ufficiale della Repubblica Italiana", Suppl. n. 238, alla G.U. n. 244 del 19/10/2001.
- McKinnon, Vine 1991 M. McKinnon, P. Vine, *Tides of War*, London, 1991.
- MDC Museum Documentation Centre, *The Destruction of Museums and Galleries in Croatia in the 1991 War*, Zagreb, s.d.
- Mengozzi 2002 G. Mengozzi, *La moschea della Tabacica a Mostar: un monumento in Guerra*, in Maniscalco 2002, 159-168.
- Nicchiarelli, Rocchi, Turlò 2000 F. Nicchiarelli, P. Rocchi, A.R. Turlò, *Manuale del risanamento: la difesa dall'umidità nella pratica edificatoria (vol. 1, Storia, fenomenologia, diagnosi; vol. 2 Le metodologie d'intervento)*, Roma, 2000.
- Nahlik 1967 S.E. Nahlik, *La protection internationale des biens culturels en cas de conflit armé*, in "Recueil des Cours de l'Académie de Droit International", 120, 2, 1967, 61-163.
- Nahlik 1974 S.E. Nahlik, *On some deficiencies of The Hague Convention of 1954 on the protection of cultural property in the event of armed conflict*, in "Annuaire de l'Association des Anciens de l'Académie", 44, 1974, 100-108.
- Noblecourt 1958 A. Noblecourt, *Protection of cultural property in the event of armed conflicts*, Paris, 1958.
- Notar 1996 C.E. Notar, *Operational Doctrine and the Environment*, "Military Review", 76, March-April 1996, 101-103.
- Office International des Musées 1939 Office International des Musées, *La Protection des Monuments et des Oeuvres d'art en Temps de Guerre*, Paris, 1939.
- O'Keefe 2000 P.J. O'Keefe, *Commentary on the UNESCO 1970 Convention on Illicit Traffic*, London, 2000.
- O'Keefe 2000a P.J. O'Keefe, *Trade in Antiquities: Reducing Destruction and Theft*, UNESCO, London-Paris, 2000.
- Oyediran 1997 J.Oyediran, *Plunder, Destruction and Despoliation, An Analysis of Israel's Violations of the International Law of Cultural*

- Property in the Occupied West Bank and Gaza Strip*, Ramallah, 1997.
- Panzerà 1993 F. Panzerà, *La tutela internazionale dei beni culturali in tempo di guerra*, Torino, 1993.
- Parker 2004 M. Parker, *Monte Cassino: the hardest-fought battle of World War II*, New York, 2004.
- Peterson, Sawyer 1998 C.E. Peterson, S.F. Sawyer (eds), *NFPA Fire Prevention Code Handbook*, Society of fire protection engineers, Quincy MA (USA), 1998.
- Piccirillo 2002 M. Piccirillo, *Conservazione e distruzione in Terra Santa*, in *Maniscalco* 2002, 271-276.
- Plenderleith, Philippot 1960 H. J. Plenderleith, P. Philippot, *Climatology and Conservation in Museums*, in "Museum", 13, 4, 1960, 202-289
- Ramachandran 1991 K. S. Ramachandran (ed.), *Gulf War and Environmental Problems*, New Delhi, 1991.
- RDC 1995 AA.VV., *A Report on the Devastation of Cultural, Historical and Natural Heritage of the Republic/Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina (from April 5, 1992, until September 5, 1995)*, Institute for the Protection of Cultural, Historical and Natural Heritage of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Sarajevo, 1995.
- Ronzitti 2001 D. Ronzitti, *Diritto internazionale dei conflitti armati*, Torino (2^a ed.), 2001.
- Roquebert 2002 M. Roquebert (ed.), *Les contaminants biologiques des biens culturels*, Paris, 2002.
- Saiz-Jimenez 2003 C. Saiz-Jimenez (ed.), *Molecular biology and cultural heritage: proceedings of the International Congress on Molecular Biology and Cultural Heritage (Sevilla 4-7 March 2003)*, Seville, 2003.
- Salemi 2000 A. Salemi, *Il recupero e la conservazione delle fabbriche tradizionali: le patologie da umidità*, Roma, 2000.
- Sánchez Hernampérez 2004 A. Sánchez Hernampérez, *A Brief Bibliography on Pest Management*, 2004, in <http://palimpsest.stanford.edu/byauth/hernampepez/pestbib.html>.
- Saporetti, Vidale 2003 C. Saporetti, M. Vidale (a cura di), *Iraq. La civiltà fatta a pezzi*, "Le Guide di Archeo", 1, 2003.
- Schmitt 1995-96 M.N. Schmitt, *Environmental Law of War: An Invitation to Critical Reexamination*, "Journal of Legal Studies" 6, 1995-1996, 237-271.
- Schwartz 1998 D. M. Schwartz, *Environmental Terrorism: Analyzing the Concept*, "Journal of Peace Research", 35, July 1998, 483-496.
- Scott 1918 Scott (a cura di), *The Hague Conventions and Declarations of 1899 and 1907*, New York, 1918.
- Smith 1996 P.D. Smith, G. Mays, *Blast effects on buildings: design of buildings to optimize resistance to blast loading*, Washington, 1996.
- Stavraki 1996 E. Stavraki, *La Convention pour la Protection des Biens Culturels en cas de conflit armé*, Athènes, 1996.
- Stovel 1998 H. Stovel, *Risk Preparedness: a Management Manual for World Cultural Heritage*, Rome, 1998.

- Taha 2002 H. Taha, *Protection of Cultural Heritage in Palestine*, in Maniscalco 2002, 265-269.
- Taylor 2005 F. Taylor, *Dresda 13 febbraio 1945: tempesta di fuoco su una citta tedesca*, Milano, 2005.
- Toman 1994 J. Toman, *La protection des biens culturels en cas de conflit armé - Commentaire de la Convention de la Haye du 14 mai 1954*, Paris, 1994.
- UNESCO 1995 *Informations sur la mise en oeuvre de la Convention pour la Protection des Biens Culturels en cas de conflit armé. Rapports de 1995*, Paris, 1995.
- Van Krieken Pieters 2002 J. Van Krieken Pieters, *Afghanistan's Shattered Cultural Heritage: Hope for Reconstruction?*, in Maniscalco 2002, 305-316.
- Venice Charter 1964 *International Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites*, Venice, 1964.
- Watts, Kaplan 2000 J. M. Watts Jr., M. E. Kaplan, *Fire Safety Codes and Heritage Preservation*, NPS Training Manual, U.S. National Park Service, Washington DC, 2000.
- Watts, Kaplan 2001 J. M. Watts Jr., M. E. Kaplan, *Fire Risk Index for Historic Buildings*, in "Fire Technology", 37, 2, 2001, 165-178.
- Wescher 1988 P. Wescher, *I furti d'arte. Napoleone e la nascita del Louvre*, Torino, 1988.
- Westing 1990 A.H. Westing (ed.), *Releasing Dangerous Forces in an Industrialized World*, London, 1990.