

WINE: A CULTURAL WORLD HERITAGE

Marina Regis Cavicchioli¹

Abstract

The processes of cultural identification make us choose what we want as memory, what we identify with in the past, and what we want to preserve. This is how we select our cultural heritage projects: as collective identity projects. The last three decades have been marked by a growing debate around the question of valuating the various types of cultural heritage. In this context, wine is considered as a world heritage phenomenon—through the vineyards and the landscape its production creates, the architecture and monuments linked to it, and its forms of production and consumption, through UNESCO's protection.

Key words

Wine; identity; heritage; politics; cultural landscape; UNESCO.

Resumo

Os processos de identificação cultural nos fazem escolher aquilo que queremos como memória, como identidade com o passado, aquilo que queremos preservar. Para tanto, como projetos identitários coletivos elegem-se os patrimônios. As últimas três décadas foram marcadas por um crescente debate em torno da questão da valorização dos diversos tipos de patrimônio cultural. Neste contexto, o vinho, através dos vinhedos e da paisagem que este constrói, das arquiteturas e dos monumentos ligados à ele, bem como suas formas de produção e consumo, coloca-se, através da proteção da UNESCO, como um patrimônio mundial.

Palavras-Chave

Vinho; Identidade; Patrimônio, Política; Paisagem Cultural; UNESCO.

¹ Assistant Professor, Federal University of Bahia, Salvador, Brazil. E-mail: cavicchioli.marina@gmail.com

As rare as it may be, or older,
only one wine is indeed excellent:
the one you drink, sweetly,
with your oldest and silent friend.

Mário Quintana

Wine and identity

When I was invited to write an article in honor of Pedro Paulo Funari, I immediately remembered all my theoretical discussions with this great master, but I also recall fondly the many glasses of wine shared with this dear friend. Thus, there is no better topic for my contribution to this festschrift than wine examined from a heritage perspective. Wine is very special in our lives, an intrinsic part of our identities: the wine that identifies me, also identifies him and creates a common identity between us, becoming, in this way, our common cultural heritage.

It is, in Freudian terms, the meaning-bearing object that represents us, the part of the self formed by melancholic identification and by relations with others, especially our closest relatives (Freud, 1914). Wine is thus a veiled affective trait contained in each cup; it takes up the distant past and makes it part of the present. Thus, for both of us, descendants of Italian immigrant families, wine is an important adjunct in the game of identity relations between the individual, the family, and the "abandoned homeland." Stuart Hall points out how the diaspora—I include immigration—mediates the processes of cultural identity (Hall, 2003: 28).

The processes of cultural identification make us choose what we want as memory, as identity with the past...what we want to preserve. Thus, heritages are selected as collective identity projects. As Funari points out:

The election of these heritages, within the postmodern theoretical framework, is understood as a political choice, aimed at the construction of a certain identity project. The possibility of reading heritage this way is supported by the concept's history. Romance languages use terms derived from the Latin *patrimonium* to refer to property inherited from the father or ancestors; an inheritance. The Germans use *Denkmalpflege*: the care of monuments, the care of what makes us think. English adopted heritage, in a more restricted sense of what was, or could be, inherited. But the English term also came to be used as a reference to monuments inherited from previous generations, by the same generalizing process that affected the Romance languages' use of the derivatives of *patrimonium*. In all these expressions there is always a reference to memory: moneo ("to

lead to think" in Latin, present in both *patrimonium* and *monumentum*), *Denkmal* (in German *denken* means "to think"), and ancestors are implicit in the term "inheritance" (Funari and Pelegrini, 2006: 10-13).

UNESCO and the Recognition of Cultures and Heritages.

Nation states have used the idea of a homogeneous collective heritage, common to the whole population, based mainly on monuments, to solidify and legitimize national identities (Cagneta, 1979; Carandini, 1995; Zevi, 2001). The period after World War II saw an opening-up to an appreciation of diversity. The peace conferences held at the end of the Second World War, and the fear of the return of imperialist nationalist states, led to the creation of the United Nations (UN) in February 1945 (ONU, 2017)². That same year, in November, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) was created with the objective of "...ensuring peace through intellectual cooperation among nations, accompanying world development and assisting member states ... in seeking solutions to problems challenge our societies" (UNESCO, 2017).³

UNESCO has created a series of mechanisms for the exchange of scientific and intellectual knowledge, including the standardization of diplomas and investments in education. UNESCO has also held conferences, followed by recommendations, declarations and a number of conventions that have been adopted worldwide for the purpose of promoting greater tolerance among nations and enhancing the cultures of different countries and their respective peoples. It has also designated specific sites as having outstanding cultural and natural heritage value.⁴

When, cultural differences and traditions notwithstanding, states agree to common rules, they can draw up an international instrument: an agreement or convention, which is legally binding, a recommendation or a declaration... UNESCO participates in this effort through its standard-setting action, serving as a central forum for coordinating the ethical, normative and intellectual issues of our time, fostering multidisciplinary exchange and mutual understanding, working - where possible and desirable - towards universal agreements on

² Initially the Charter of the United Nations was signed by 50 countries, excluding those that had been part of the Axis, which would only enter the organization some time later.

³ The first agreements of UNESCO were made in December 1948.

⁴ International conventions subject to ratification, acceptance, or accession by states. They define rules with which the states comply.

these issues, defining benchmarks and mobilizing international opinion (UNESCO, 2017).

However, it is important to note that the concept of heritage initially used by UNESCO was linked to the idea of a monument, object of art, or national identity, viewed in a homogeneous and uniform manner. On the other hand, a significant paradigm change has occurred through the decades, as we will show below.

The Protection of Cultural Property

Still heavily influenced by the conflicts of the Second World War, UNESCO promulgated the Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict, also known as the 1954 Hague Convention, to which a second protocol was added in 1999. In its first article we find a definition of cultural property:

Article 1. Definition of cultural property

For the purposes of the present Convention, the term 'cultural property' shall cover, irrespective of origin or ownership:

(a) movable or immovable property of great importance to the cultural heritage of every people, such as monuments of architecture, art or history, whether religious or secular; archaeological sites; groups of buildings which, as a whole, are of historical or artistic interest; works of art; manuscripts, books and other objects of artistic, historical or archaeological interest; as well as scientific collections and important collections of books or archives or of reproductions of the property defined above;

(b) buildings whose main and effective purpose is to preserve or exhibit the movable cultural property defined in sub-paragraph (a) such as museums, large libraries and depositories of archives, and refuges intended to shelter, in the event of armed conflict, the movable cultural property defined in sub-paragraph (a);

(c) centers containing a large amount of cultural property as defined in sub-paragraphs (a) and (b), to be known as 'centers containing monuments' (UNESCO, 2017).

The Recommendation of New Delhi of 1956 focused on the protection of archaeological and museum heritage. The Paris Recommendation of 1962 included the protection of locations of exceptional beauty and landscapes, as well as their respective territories. The concept of cultural heritage was

extended to natural, rural or urban sites and landscapes⁵. In 1964 the concern was different: the Paris Recommendation of 1964 deals with measures to prohibit and prevent the export, import, and transfer of illicit cultural property.

In the 1966 Declaration of Principles of International Cultural Cooperation we perceive the attempt to value cultural diversity:

Article 1

1. All culture has a dignity and a value that must be respected and safeguarded.
2. All peoples have the right and duty to develop their respective cultures.
3. All cultures are part of the common heritage of humanity, in its fruitful variety, diversity and reciprocal influence (UNESCO, 2017)

A different theme was addressed in the Paris Recommendation of 1968, which concerned itself with the problems generated by urban growth, with recommendations on patrimony (public and private) and urban interventions.

In 1971, it was the turn of the Convention on Wetlands of International Importance, which emphasized waterfowl habitats. The environment was once again at the forefront of the Stockholm Convention on the Human Environment, which resulted in the Stockholm Declaration of 1972 that sought to establish common criteria for the preservation and improvement of the environment.

Perhaps the best-known UNESCO convention is the Paris Recommendation on the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage of 1972. In this convention a program for the national and international protection of cultural property was proposed, promoting awareness of preservation for present and future generations (IPHAN - Paris Recommendation, 1972).

Signed by the 159 participating states and establishing its own criteria and parameters, it has become a tool that recognizes and protects sites of cultural and natural heritage of universal value. UNESCO has thus

⁵ In the same year, the Letter of Venice was drawn up, another heritage letter, but this time created by the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS), demonstrating that the debates about heritage were taking place in different fora.

become one of the most important bodies worldwide for the recognition and protection of heritage⁶.

In 1976 the Nairobi Recommendations were published whose central theme was the safeguarding of historical sites and their role in contemporary life. But it was in the Paris Recommendation on the Safeguarding of Traditional and Popular Culture of 1989 that extended the concept of culture (IPHAN - Paris Recommendation, 1989):

... the Paris Recommendation (1989) attributes to culture an important social, economic and political role, recognizing the value of national identity. It highlights the importance of the dissemination of patrimonial knowledge for the common good of society and the creation of mechanisms for the protection of this culture, with education as the main focus in this process. (Campos, Rodrigues and Funari, 2017: 336)

The 1992 Rio Letter is a return to the issue of environment and development. It reaffirms the declaration adopted in Stockholm in 1972 and presents 28 principles establishing a new alliance and new levels of cooperation to achieve international agreements aimed at the integrity of environmental and global development (IPHAN - Rio Letter, 1992). In the same year, the category of cultural landscape was included in the Cultural Patrimony of Humanity. The 1992 Convention, in Article 1, defined cultural landscapes as representing the "combined works of man and nature" (UNESCO, 2017).

In 1997 UNESCO introduced the Proclamation of the Oral and Intangible Heritage of Humanity, and in 2003, the Convention for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage. In 2001 it was the turn of the Protection of Underwater Cultural Heritage. In 2005 the Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions was approved, by a large majority.

Worthy of note is the 2005 UNESCO Convention, which deals with the protection and promotion of diversity and cultural expressions. It recognizes, over the past decade, the sovereign right of governments to introduce policies to protect and promote the diversity of cultural expressions. Emphasizes that the economic dimension is intrinsically linked to the cultural dimension - generating jobs and income, fostering innovation and sustainable economic growth and, at the same time, transmitting identities and values, promoting social inclusion and a sense of belonging" (Bokova, 2016 In Campos, Rodrigues and Funari, 2017: 330)

⁶ Although UNESCO is an international organization of unparalleled recognition, it is important to point out that international discussions about the protection and appreciation of heritage occurred previously, as we can see in the Letters of Athens of 1931 and 1933.

Regarding the cultural issue, at present, Unesco recognizes CULTURE as

the basis of identity, energy and the creative ideas of peoples, culture, in all its diversity, is a factor of development and coexistence around the world. In this sense, UNESCO develops and promotes the application of normative instruments in the cultural sphere, in addition to developing activities for the protection of cultural heritage, the protection and stimulation of cultural diversity, as well as the promotion of pluralism and dialogue between cultures and civilizations. (UNESCO, 2017).

Recognizing Heritage

As we have seen, the last three decades, have been marked by a growing debate about the value of the various types of cultural heritage. This debate has involved, in addition to UNESCO, public bodies such as municipalities, governmental departments of culture, and other international bodies,⁷ such as the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) and the academic milieu. These debates decisively influenced the reformulation of the concept of patrimony so that, in addition to traditional monuments, new elements both material and immaterial, gained the status of patrimony.

Thus, new phenomena – material and immaterial: structures, artifacts, landscapes, songs, fables, foods, and ways of doing things – have been incorporated as cultural heritage. However, none of these things is, a priori, patrimony. This is the result of intentional, political choice: an object becomes heritage because a group of people decides to invest it with a special value (Chastel, 1997: 143).

When an object operates as a common symbol for a group of individuals, it becomes representative of that group's culture. It is a part of the forging of an identity; it becomes...heritage. We also know that these symbols gain even greater appreciation when they are linked to a long tradition; history, considered as a collective past, is also a key legitimizing element of cultural identity.

It was in this sense that wine gained heritage status. The nature of wine's preparation and consumption reveals a great deal about social, economic and, especially, cultural relations. One example of this is the 2006 UNESCO Chair Culture and Traditions of Wine, headquartered at the

⁷ It should be noted that, in addition to the patrimonial measures generated by the UNESCO convention, other institutions have drawn up important statements concerned with safeguarding cultural assets of various kinds.

University of Burgundy, comprising the Jules Guyot Institute and the Maison des Sciences de l'Homme in Dijon, but incorporating, too, participants from various countries on five continents, it has in its justification the idea of wine as a cultural product, a heritage to be safeguarded :

Toutes les activités de la chaire sont ciblées sur une approche pluridisciplinaire et internationale du vin comme produit « culturel » par excellence. Elles s'inscrivent dans les programmes prioritaires de l'UNESCO, tels que la diffusion de l'éducation et de la recherche, la culture... ainsi que la sauvegarde du patrimoine. A ce titre, toutes les disciplines sont concernées, les sciences exactes, comme les sciences humaines et sociales impliquées dans la problématique de la vigne, du vin et de leur patrimoine culturel. (Chaire UNESCO Vin et Culture, 2016)

The creation of this chair was not an isolated phenomenon. In 2006, as a result of the previous year's approval of the Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Expressions, international heritage gatherings debated the entry of the terroir into the list of World Cultural Heritage Sites (Cavicchioli, 2006: 73).

The concept of terroir is broad and controversial and has not been institutionalized by UNESCO. However, in 1992 this institution incorporated the concept of a cultural landscape which made possible the inclusion of viticultural landscapes in this category, as well as technologies and techniques of producing wine in the intangible cultural heritage category, discussed below.

The Cultural Landscape: The Construction of a Concept

What are landscapes? There is already a linguistic peculiarity in this question. The International Council of Museums (ICOM), introducing the theme of museums and cultural landscapes, introduced a diversity of concepts. In English, there is a particular emphasis on land, as opposed to other terms that exist in that language and that refer to the urban environment (cityscape) and even view of the sky (skyscape). Already in the neo-Latin languages of ICOM, in French and Spanish, the expression landscape (paysage, paisaje) derives from country, a term that designates the earth and needs adjectives to designate the urban or sky landscape. This means that the cultural landscape is defined by the relationship between the human being and nature, since the land and the country are human creations. In this context, cultural landscape only intensifies, with the adjective, the human aspect of the natural context. Landscapes, therefore, are a mixture of what grows and fructifies (this is the sense of physis, in Greek, and of natura, in Latin, what is born and grows) and how humans interpret, manipulate and transform the environment. Cultural landscape, with these two terms, puts the emphasis on this human appropriation. Thus, both

museums and cultural landscapes are centered on the human being, whose characteristics are the most contradictory (Funari, 2016).

Initially, the 1972 Convention on the Protection of World Cultural and Natural Heritage distinguished these two types of heritage, which were judged by different groups of experts. Cultural heritage was divided into three broad categories: monuments, collections, and sites. The natural ones, were also placed into three categories: natural monuments, geological and physiographic formations, and natural sites. There were also sites considered to be both, which should fit the criteria and categories of both natural and cultural heritage (UNESCO, 2009: 16).

With the 1992 inclusion of cultural landscape within the Cultural Heritage of Humanity, this hybrid category gained prominence with an emphasis on man/landscape interaction, culture being viewed as an active agent. For UNESCO

the term “cultural landscape” embraces a diversity of manifestations of the interaction between humankind and its natural environment. Cultural landscapes often reflect specific techniques of sustainable land-use, techniques that consider the characteristics and limits of the natural environment imbued by a spiritual relationship to nature. Protection of cultural landscapes can contribute to modern techniques of sustainable land-use. The continued existence of traditional forms of land-use supports biological diversity in many regions of the world. The protection of traditional cultural landscapes is therefore crucial in maintaining this biological diversity (UNESCO, 2017).

The Wine as Heritage

Within the category of cultural landscapes, several wine-producing regions have been designated World Heritage Sites by UNESCO. The first of these was the Jurisdiction of Saint-Emilion in the Bordeaux region of south-west France in 1999. One of the world's most recognized wine-producing regions, the region is filled with historic chateaux such as Château Cheval Blanc, which also received the seal of world heritage in the same year and is a producer of an iconic wine of the same name. In addition to the chateaux there are a number of medieval historical monuments; the city of Saint-Emilion, founded in the 8th century still retains medieval buildings. However, the criteria for designating the jurisdiction of Saint-Emilion was not the quality of its wines, and not even the significance of its chateaux or the remnants of the medieval city. It is the historic vineyards that form the impressive landscape, the monuments are coadjuvant: “The great peculiarity of this region that

makes it a unique site is to have preserved the agrarian structures from centuries as the middle ages” (UNESCO, 2015: 21).

To enter the list of World Heritage sites, the site must have an exceptional universal value and must meet at least one selection criterion used by UNESCO. It is important to remember that by the end of 2004 the World Heritage sites were selected based on six cultural and four natural criteria. With the adoption of revised Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention there is only one set of ten criteria. Among them, wine-growing landscapes generally meet one of the following criteria:

(ii) to exhibit an important interchange of human values, over a span of time or within a cultural area of the world, on developments in architecture or technology, monumental arts, town-planning or landscape design;

(iii) to bear a unique or at least exceptional testimony to a cultural tradition or to a civilization which is living or which has disappeared;

(iv) to be an outstanding example of a type of building, architectural or technological ensemble or landscape which illustrates (a) significant stage(s) in human history;

(v) to be an outstanding example of a traditional human settlement, land-use, or sea-use which is representative of a culture (or cultures), or human interaction with the environment especially when it has become vulnerable under the impact of irreversible change;

Thus, Saint-Emilion meets criteria iii and v as follows:

Criterion (iii): The Jurisdiction of Saint-Emilion is an outstanding example of an historic vineyard landscape that has survived intact and in activity to the present day.

Criterion (iv): The intensive cultivation of grapes for wine production in a precisely defined region and the resulting landscape is illustrated in an exceptional way by the historic Jurisdiction of Saint-Emilion.

After the inclusion of Saint-Emilion, the door was open to the entrance of other cultural landscapes with cultivation of vines in the list of world patrimonies: Wachau in Austria, the Alto Douro region of Portugal (2001), the Fertő/Neusiedlersee region between Hungary and Austria, the Upper Middle Rhine in Germany, the Tokaj region in Hungary, Pico Island in Portugal, Lavaux in Switzerland, the Piedmont in Italy, the Champagne hillsides, houses and cellars in France, and the Burgundy terroir in France.

Viticultural Landscapes and Cultural Identity

While it is possible to claim that the cultural landscapes mentioned above privilege a European heritage, we must emphasize that these choices are not only a reflection of UNESCO's policies, but also of the particular candidate's national or regional political and identity actions. In this sense, several issues must be considered.

Wine was the first beverage to enter (if indirectly) the list of UNESCO world heritage sites, but is not an isolated case. Mexican Tequila was incorporated as heritage too, since the traditional cultural landscape of the agave has also been approved as a UNESCO World Heritage phenomenon.

Another relevant case is the cultural landscape of southern Jerusalem, Battir. Named "Palestine: Land of Olives and Vines - Cultural Landscape of Southern Jerusalem, Battir", it entered the UNESCO list in 2014. Although great emphasis is given to the production of grapes, since antiquity, no mention is made of wine production. We know that this region produced wine for centuries. However, for religious and cultural reasons today, there is no intention to establish a link with this wine-producing past.

Heritage is a means of constructing collective memory because it is a reflection of culture, revealing a group that identifies itself with it. It is a constructor and legitimator of national, regional, ethnic, religious and gender identities. In this sense heritage embodies the set of social relations that surrounds it. Thus, "What for some is heritage for others is not ... In addition, social values change with time" (Funari and Pelegrini, 2006: 10).

What, then, are the reasons why a particular wine producing region tries to be included in UNESCO's list of world heritage sites? One factor is the high degree of tourist involvement and the consequent economic gain that this can generate:

The UNESCO seal gives the sites a World Heritage emblem that is a cultural and economic attraction both for the regions and the countries where the sites are located and for the important flow of cultural and ecological tourism. Cultural tourism is one of the main by-products of the classification of a site as a world heritage. (Funari and Pelegrini, 2006: 26).

We also know that in many countries this is an important factor in encouraging governments to invest public funds in preserving, researching and disseminating knowledge about certain sites. However,

it should be noted that a 2007 PricewaterhouseCoopers study on the costs and benefits of UNESCO World Heritage site inscription demonstrates the high cost of proposing an inscription (PricewaterhouseCoopers, 2007: 2 -4 and 11-13).

This demonstrates the role of cultural identity; culture groups and states utilize the UNESCO world heritage list as a means of international recognition and appreciation of their viticultural and culinary traditions; economics are important but cultural pride and group solidarity are equally relevant factors in the selection and emphasis of heritage expression. Wine is an element of identity for those who live in producing regions and their descendants, but it has become an inscription of *world* heritage too. How did this come about? To enter the celebrated world heritage list, it is necessary to prove that these cultural landscapes are of exceptional universal value and that wine production is a determining factor in the natural landscape and in the cultural and historical context of a place.

The idea that the heritage of a region may be of universal value comes from the foundation of UNESCO in a post-World War II context—the ideal of human and environmental diversity as a universal value to be promoted. (Funari and Pelegrini, 2006: 23).

Conclusions

The preservation of cultural landscapes and the traditional ways of producing wine are essential to preserving wine's cultural heritage. Part of this is the dissemination of research and its accessibility to a wide audience. The experience and knowledge of wine is a sensual, intimate form of cultural identity and the collective experience of wine consumption and viticultural history is the quintessence of cultural heritage. While the culture of wine relates closely to patrimony and to group identity, drinking wine is a dynamic, empathetic experience, which often leads to a search for new knowledge about the culture that it is a part of. Thus, while not everyone can access a bottle of Cheval Blanc, Tokaji, or Barolo, the local-culture heritage of wine expands, to become part of a shared world heritage.

Wine—through vineyards and the landscape it has created, by the architecture and monuments where it is produced, sold and consumed, and the methods of production and consumption—has become a world heritage, partly through the work of UNESCO.

Even if we might consider its landscapes and edifices as mainly European heritage viticultural heritage has gained acceptance and approval by an assembly composed also of member countries where alcohol is prohibited by religious mores. This can be viewed as tolerance of diversity. If the approval of this patrimony is linked to political and economic issues, identity and empathy issues are equally linked to it. Social adhesion is created on different scales through cultural affections (Safatle, 2016: 17). Thus, the pride of some identities may be reflected in profit for others, but the whole world can toast this heritage!

Bibliography

BOKOVA, I. *Prefácio: re/pensar as políticas culturais: 10 anos de promoção da diversidade das expressões culturais para o desenvolvimento*. Paris: Unesco, 2016. (Relatório Global da Convenção 2015). Disponível em: <<http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0024/002430/243029por.pdf>>. Acesso em: 20 nov.2016.

CAGNETTA, Marinella: *Antichisti e impero fascista*. Bari: Dedalo Libri, 1979.

CARANDINI, Andrea: *Archeologia e Cultura Materiale*. Roma: De Donato, 1995.

CAMPOS, Juliano; RODRIGUES, Mirian Helen e FUNARI, Pedro Paulo Abreu. O Patrimônio Arqueológico no Licenciamento Cultural: Legislação, Políticas Culturais e Gestão Integrada. *In Oculum ensaios*. N14 (2)Dossiê Patrimônio Arqueológico. Campinas : Maio-Agosto 2017, p.331-347.

CAVICCHIOLI, Marina. O terroir e a Identidade Cultural. *In Adega*. Ano 6, no10, 2006.

CHAIRE UNESCO VIN et CULTURE. <https://chaireunesco-vinetculture.u-bourgogne.fr>. Acesso em: 26 de agosto de 2006.

CHASTEL, Andre: La notion de patrimoine, in Pierre. Nora (ed.), *Les lieux de mémoire* (1984-1992). Paris: Gallimard, 1997, p. 1433-1469

FREUD, Sigmund. (1914). *Narcisismo: uma introdução*. In: *A história do movimento psicanalítico, artigos sobre metapsicologia e outros trabalhos*. Rio de

Janeiro: Imago, 1976. p. 85-120 (Edição standard brasileira das obras psicológicas completas de Sigmund Freud, XIV).

FUNARI, Pedro Paulo Abreu; ORSER JÚNIOR, Charles; SCHIAVETTO, Solange: *Identidades, discurso e poder: Estudos da arqueologia contemporânea*. São Paulo: Annablume, 2005.

FUNARI, Pedro Paulo Abreu e PELEGRINI, Sandra Cássia. *Patrimônio Histórico e Cultural*. Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar Editor: 2006.

FUNARI, Pedro Paulo Abreu. Museus e paisagens culturais: avanços e desafios. .In *Revista Museu.com.br*, 2016,249. Disponível em : <http://www.revistamuseu.com.br/site/index.php/br/artigos/18-de-maio/249->

IPHAN. Instituto do Patrimônio Histórico e Artístico Nacional (Brasil). *Cartas patrimoniais*. 3 ed. rev. e aum. Rio de Janeiro: IPHAN, 2004.

ONU. Disponível em: < <https://nacoesunidas.org> acesso em 16 de outubro de 2017.

PricewaterhouseCoopers, (PWC): 'The Costs and Benefits of UK World Heritage Site Status, A literature review for the Department for Culture, Media and Sport do Reino Unido, 2007.

PORTUGAL: *Diário Da República – Resolução da Assembleia da República n.º 26/2000 que Aprova, para ratificação, a Convenção para a Protecção dos Bens Culturais em Caso de Conflito Armado*, adotada na Haia em 14 de Maio de 1954. – I SERIE-A N.º 76 – 30 de Março de 2000.

SAFATLE, Vladimir. *Circulo do Afetos: Corpos políticos, desamparo, e o fim do indivíduo*. São Paulo: Autêntica Editora, 2016.

RECOMENDAÇÃO de Nova Delhi, 1956. Disponível em: <<http://portal.iphan.gov.br/uploads/ckfinder/arquivos/Recomendacao%20de%20Nova%20Dheli%201956.pdf>

UNESCO, Cultural Landiscape. Disponível em: <<http://whc.unesco.org/en/culturallandscape>> .Acessos em novembro de 2017

UNESCO. The World Heritage List. Disponível: em <<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list>>. Vários acessos em: de setembro a novembro de 2017.

UNESCO; World Heritage Committee (WHC). Operational guidelines for the implementation of the world heritage convention. Paris: UNESCO, 2008. Disponível em: <<http://whc.unesco.org/archive/opguide08-pt.pdf>>. Acesso em: 28 ago. 2017.

UNESCO.

www.unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0012/001271/127160por.pdf. Vários acessos em setembro e outubro de 2017.

ZEVI, Fausto. Aspetti dell'archeologia pompeiana nel Novecento: gli scavi Del Mauri a Pompei. In GUZZO, Pier Giovanni (org.). *Pompei Scienza e Società*. Milão: Electa, 2001.