

Cultural Property Protection in the Event of Armed Conflict – Austrian Experiences

FRIEDRICH SCHIPPER,^{a, b, c} FRANZ SCHULLER,^{a, b, d}
 KARL VON HABSBURG-LOTHRINGEN,^{a, c, d}
 HOLGER EICHBERGER,^{a, b, d, f} ERICH FRANK,^{a, b, d}
 AND NORBERT FÜRSTENHOFER,^{a, d}

THE ORIGIN OF MILITARY CPP IN AUSTRIA

The current Austrian situation concerning the standard and level of implementation of the 1954 *Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict*, especially within the Austrian Armed Forces (AAF), is not the product of concentrated and well-organised activity; it is rather the result of a number of individuals' efforts while working in a variety of positions at the right time. A long time passed between Austria's 1964 ratification of the 1954 Hague Convention and its implementation and dissemination within the AAF.

The first Austrian 'military mission' in which cultural property protection (CPP) played a minor, although unofficial role, occurred in 1968 in the context of the 'Prague Spring'. The Austrian government and military leaders expected Soviet troops to cross Austrian territory on their way to Prague, violating the country's sovereignty and neutrality. Knowing that the Soviet troops could not be stopped by military force, Austria prepared for invasion. On the initiative of the Federal Bureau for Monuments and Sites (FBMS), and under the supervision of its provincial departments, hundreds of copies of the Blue Shield, the emblem of the 1954 Hague Convention, were distributed in several districts of eastern and northern Austria and, through the active participation of gendarmerie and army officers, these were attached to historical or cultural monuments along the predicted Soviet route through Austria. It was greatly feared that Soviet troops would not respect the country's rich cultural heritage, which had already suffered so badly during World War II – at this time the traces of this damage and destruction were still visible at many cultural sites. The idea was that this time the enemy would at least be made aware of the fact that with every single destructive step they took they were likely to be violating international law. This form

- a Austrian Society for the Protection of Cultural Property
- b Austrian National Committee of the Blue Shield
- c University of Vienna
- d Austrian Armed Forces
- e Association of National Committees of the Blue Shield
- f UMIT Health and Life Sciences University Hall

of resistance without force at the climax of the Cold War signalled the birth of a kind of 'Blue Shield Movement' in Austria which finally resulted in the foundation of the Austrian Society for the Protection of Cultural Property in 1980. This civil organisation is still characterised by many regular and militia army officers among its membership, who are entrusted with most of the positions on its steering board. The Society also played an initial and decisive role in setting up the Austrian National Committee of the Blue Shield in 2008. Therefore, both organisations – forming an interface between civil and military expertise as well as providing an unrivalled pool of experts within Austria – consequently have an interest and high competence in all issues of military CPP.

Meanwhile, the Hague Convention corpora developed into one of Austria's 'favourite aspects' of international law and the Austrian government demonstrates serious effort in, and commitment to, this special field. At the international level, this is manifest in Austria's contribution to the development of the Second Protocol to the 1954 Convention. Austria was not only host to one of the revision conferences but it took a decisive role in the revision of the original document. Austria entered this diplomatic arena at the right point in time.

CIVIL EFFORTS: IDENTIFICATION AND REGISTRATION OF CP

In response to the conflicts that have occurred since the early 1990s, a new discussion arose about the application and effectiveness of CPP during armed conflicts, especially concerning the value and effectiveness of the 1954 Hague Convention.

Critique or renaissance of the 1954 Hague Convention

International organisations such as UNESCO came under pressure from the media and public opinion during events such as the conflicts in Croatia (and in particular the siege of Dubrovnik); Bosnia-Herzegovina and Kosovo; the war in Iraq (in particular the looting of the National Museum in Baghdad and archaeological sites throughout the country); the attacks on the Bamiyan Buddha statues in Afghanistan; and in Lebanon (in particular, the destruction of cultural urban heritage in the southern part of the country). The problem, though, was that UNESCO – although being the 'international guardian' for the 1954 Hague Convention – had, and has, no proactive operations branch and no means to actively protect cultural property. It also lacks any form of special political authority.

As the issue is considered more closely, it soon becomes obvious that many national states, even those which are party to the 1954 Convention, have not really implemented the Convention and adopted it into their national law and regulations in a considered manner, if at all. A large number of member states have a horizontal national dissemination on a governmental level without any deeper vertical adoption and implementation. The main problem preventing most experts from dealing more intensively with the military aspect of CPP is the problem of selection and designation of cultural property to be protected under the 1954 Convention. This challenge is not even purely military, but rather a social and public problem.

In working with the 1954 Convention in the past, two scenarios were generally faced: national defence and international operations. In a comparison of the position – or role – of cultural property in armed conflicts over the last 50 years, an increasing readiness to involve such property directly in conflict can be recognised, especially in recent times. In today's world we face new challenges from threats such as so-called asymmetric conflicts, supra-national inter-ethnic and inter-religious wars, but also from the menaces of terrorism and extortion. Cultural property's position has changed dramatically, into that of a deliberate target, rather than a victim of collateral damage.

Destruction of cultural property in World War II mostly occurred by chance or as collateral damage. Even the bombings of Dresden or Monte Cassino, which caused vast destruction of cultural property, were not directed at the property itself, and there was no intention or ambition to destroy and extinguish it forever. In contrast, in recent ethnic conflicts and confrontations we find that the intention to destroy cultural property is a primary goal: the banishment of people is followed by damage to or the destruction of their cultural heritage.

For international peace-supporting and peace-keeping forces these changes represent a drastically new challenge and task. It must be remembered that many people have very strong bonds to their cultural heritage, especially when combined with or related to religion and religious symbols, and military actions against cultural property represent an attack on the *emotions* directly. In these kinds of situations military leaders are put in the position of having social responsibilities that are as important as their military commands: so what can be done and how should military planners and their civilian advisers prepare?

The civil sector of implementation

There are two main sectors for the implementation and adoption of the 1954 Hague Convention: the civil and the military. Cooperation between the civil and military communities can be somewhat difficult and sometimes even fractious. A good and respectful climate of inter-ministerial discussion is essential. Regardless of the different functions of civil and military directorates, the main focus and common goal has to be to preserve, keep and secure cultural heritage.

In Austria the civil sector falls into:

- the Federal Ministry of Education, Art and Culture (MoE) (Following legal adoption, the Ministry will generally be the administrator/guardian of the 1954 Convention) and
- the FBMS (Ensuing from Article 3 of the 1954 Convention and Article 5 of the Second Protocol ['designation of competent authorities responsible for the safeguarding of cultural property'])

The first and principal task of these authorities in implementing the 1954 Convention and its Protocols is the selection and designation of cultural property to be protected under the Convention and its Second Protocol. Owing to differing interests and opinions (both public and private) and the fact that various authorities and organisations (eg

other ministries, economic entities, companies, societies and organisations) are concerned parties, selection and designation can be, and in fact is, one of the most difficult procedures. The establishment of an inter-ministerial platform (committee) is helpful (with at least MoD, Ministry of Justice and Ministry of Foreign Affairs, national UNESCO Commission and Red Cross/Crescent representatives, as well as representatives of the territorial bodies involved).

Other countries have also addressed this challenge. A good example is the Islamic Republic of Iran. In 1989 a National Advisory Committee (with legal, technical and educational subcommittees) consisting of the MoD, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Iranian National Commission for UNESCO and the Iranian Cultural Heritage Organization was formed. Madagascar also adopted a similar approach. Following Austria's experiences when implementing the 1954 Convention in the past, the Austrian authorities were likely to support such models and solutions. When implementing the Second Protocol, Austria originally considered creating such a committee. However, in the end all preparatory work was done by the FBMS alone and cooperation in the form of the above-mentioned committees was limited to the regional/provincial level (eg territorial military command).

For countries involved in the implementation phase of the Second Protocol, an independent Non-Governmental Organisation (NGO) similar to the ones that exist already in Switzerland, Austria, Italy, Romania and Germany ('Swiss/Austrian/Italian/Romanian/German Society for the Protection of Cultural Property') or in the form of national committees of the Blue Shield could also be very helpful. NGOs function as opinion leaders in cooperation with the media. They offer their expertise and support if necessary. They are willing to undertake controversial but correct and important long-term measures on behalf of the governments' interests. NGOs try to be a link between the various sectors of the government and, above all, can be a good advocate of the cultural heritage.

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE 1954 HAGUE CONVENTION

In the civil sector (operative structure)

After implementing the 1954 Hague Convention as federal law, a special office, the '1954 Hague Convention Office', was created in the FBMS. A highly experienced civil servant was designated head of the office in order to comply with the requirements of the 1954 Convention. Together with a number of colleagues, also from the military sector, they started their work. The first and most difficult step, as already mentioned, was the selection of the cultural property to be protected from the list of national monuments. Based on the results of a meeting of UNESCO experts in Switzerland in 1956, four levels (A–D) of cultural property were created (international/world heritage, national, regional and local). From today's perspective this task of identifying several thousand monuments and sites was far too complex and detailed and therefore not practicable. The following sections explain and demonstrate the importance of the above-mentioned committees in national cooperation, as well as the necessity of exchanging experiences at an international level.

The FBMS: responsibilities and activities

Upon ratification of the 1954 Hague Convention by Austria (Federal Law Gazette no 58/1964), the MoE entrusted the FBMS with the responsibility of implementing the Convention. Under its current statutes, the FBMS continues to be responsible for this implementation. It has taken, and continues to take, essential measures within the framework of the 1954 Convention concerning the selection and identification of cultural property under protection (eg by compiling lists and maps of such cultural property).

Since 1 January 2000 the FBMS has been entrusted directly with the implementation of the 1954 Convention by the *Monument Protection Act*. The FBMS has already compiled an extensive array of lists and maps of cultural property to be protected, as well as an emergency databank. As noted above, cultural property has so far been categorised within four categories, namely 'A, B, C, D', where 'D' refers to objects of local significance. This categorisation is in compliance with the recommendations adopted at a UNESCO experts meeting in Switzerland in 1956. Austria has approximately 50,000 monuments and sites listed, which is an unusually high number in comparison to other signatory states, which did not implement the experts' recommendations. However, since international conventions have to be interpreted in line with international customs, there is a need for Austria to adjust its practice to bring it into line with the internationally applied standards for assessing the significance of cultural property. The definition of cultural property in Article 1 of the 1954 Convention merely talks of property that is 'of great importance to the cultural heritage of every people', but it does not provide a more detailed definition of this qualitative term. Since Austria is the only country to observe the above-mentioned UNESCO experts' recommendations, it has become necessary to establish new lists of cultural property based on internationally customary principles of evaluation. This adjustment will result in a drastic reduction in the number of objects to be protected according to the 1954 Convention. Thus, Austria has been, and still is, confronted with two essential problems: defining the number of monuments and sites subject to the 1954 Convention, and defining the responsibilities and obligations of the individual under the 1954 Convention. The necessary regulations have now been incorporated in the *Amendment to the Monument Protection Act* that became operative on 1 January 2000. Section 13 of the Act now includes the following provisions:

1. Immovable monuments (including their components and accessories), as well as movable monuments, as defined by Article 1 of the UNESCO Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict (Hague Convention) and promulgated in Federal Law Gazette no 58/1964, which are of great importance to the cultural heritage of every people shall be inscribed on a list to be established by the FBMS. This list shall also contain objects which serve to preserve, exhibit or shelter cultural property and thus come under the protection of the convention within the meaning of the aforementioned article.
2. A pre-condition for inclusion in the list pursuant to paragraph 1 shall be that the monuments in question are of utmost significance for Austria's stock of monuments.

Decisions on their inclusion shall be guided by the internationally customary interpretation of the 1954 Hague Convention concerning the requisite importance of a property.

3. Monuments to be included in the list shall either be classified monuments or, if they are not, shall enjoy immediate institution of classification proceedings.
4. The MoD, the respective provincial governors, mayors and owners may object to inscription on the list by contesting the property's Hague Convention standard for protection, and may apply for its non-inclusion in or deletion from the list. Such an application can be rejected by decree only. The FBMS may delete objects from the list if the pre-conditions for their inclusion have changed.
5. Reference to inclusion in the list shall, if possible, be made by placing distinctive signs on the monuments according to the 1954 HC [...] The FBMS shall be entitled to instruct the owner, or any other party authorized to dispose of the property, by decree on how and to what extent the objects are to be marked [...]
6. Disregard of such a decreed instruction for marking according to the Hague Convention shall be forbidden, and so shall be any abusive kind of marking. Marking shall also be deemed abusive whenever it is of such a nature that it may lead to the erroneous assumption that it represents the distinctive emblem of the 1954 Hague Convention.
7. The existing lists and maps of cultural property under protection, certificates and entitlements to affix the 1954 Hague Convention emblems shall become invalid by 31 December 2009 at the latest [...]
8. Detailed regulations on how to proceed in the compilation of lists, etc. [...] shall be defined by the MoE (in agreement with the MoD) by decree.

The explanatory notes accompanying the *Amendment to the Monument Protection Act* discuss in greater detail a number of important issues and problems, such as:

- a) Any cultural property having the requisite great importance is to be included in the list even though this may – eg for military reasons – be undesirable.
- b) Also local peculiarities can, in exceptional cases, be of greatest importance to Austria's overall stock of monuments and therefore warrant their inscription on the list.
- c) Cultural property deemed as subject to the provisions of the 1954 Hague Convention must in future be classified as monument or immediately become classified as such. It is thus not within the discretion of the FBMS to deem cultural property of great importance and include it in the 1954 Hague Convention list on the one hand, and not put it under preservation order on the other. Such an approach would be a contradiction in terms. However, there is no need to classify any listed objects as monuments under preservation order which, by themselves, are not monuments worthy of protection within the meaning of the *Monument Protection Act*, but which are used to preserve movable cultural property under protection (such as insignificant

buildings that house important museum collections or archives), or merely constitute the setting for the actually valuable objects (as in historic centres).

- d) The deadline for completing the change-over to the new lists is 31 December 2009. Since this conversion requires extensive administrative measures, it would have been unrealistic to establish any earlier date.

As far as the decree mentioned in section 13 is concerned, *The Monument Protection Act* says that the detailed provisions on how to proceed in the compilation of lists, etc, will be defined by the MoE by decree. Any such decree will thus have to respond to the needs arising for a particular site in conjunction with the compilation of new lists and will take into account international standards regarding the compilation of lists and drawing of maps of cultural property under protection. This means that before any monument is added to the list there will be in-depth discussions between the ministries involved, in particular the MoD and the MoE, to define the requirements and solutions in compliance with practical needs.

Historically, lists of cultural property relating to the 1954 Hague Convention were developed for each federal province. These lists were compiled, partly edited into catalogues and then handed over to the MoD, where they immediately became the main working documents for the army and Cultural Property Protection Officers (CPPOs). Parallel to the selection of monuments, rules for the use of the Blue Shield emblem were drawn up. Monuments rated as Category A–C received the emblem automatically while monuments rated as Category D had to apply to use it. More recently, the production of special cultural property maps for each region has been important. At the same time special leaflets concerning measures for the protection of cultural property by civilians and public institutions, especially private owners and corporate owners such as churches and religious communities, were produced.

MILITARY EFFORTS: TRAINING AND RESPONSIBILITY OF THE AAF

General considerations

CPP is a task that has to be fulfilled in times of peace. Starting CPP measures once armed conflict has begun is too late, since other problems then have higher priority. The protection of cultural property in the event of armed conflict has to be a part of the military doctrine drafted by political authorities. It can then be transferred into military 'rules of engagement'. On the basis of these 'rules of engagement', orders can be developed and carried out. CPP has to be implemented into general military training as well as into the planning and execution of military missions, and to enable this to happen CPPOs have to be deployed in all branches of the armed forces. Therefore, in Austria military CPP is based on the assignment of CPPOs.

Military service in Austria

In Austria military service is obligatory for every male citizen when they reach 18 years of age, and there is an annual general draft split into four enlistment points

per year. Women are not conscripted but may volunteer. Over and above this obligatory service, all citizens having finished 12 grades of school (usually at the age of 18) are free to volunteer for a career as Army or Army Militia Officer. However, unlike the armed forces of many other countries, AAF officers have to undertake complete basic training and service as a basic recruit for half a year and as a Private and Corporal for a further six months. Aspiring officers finish their first year of training as a Sergeant, followed by another three years of training and service as Officer Cadets – either full-time at the military academy or part-time in the militia. On completion of their training they are given the rank of Lieutenant and are transferred to regular regimental service, where they continue their career. Officers may start a higher military specialist career – eg as CPPOs – only after having been promoted to Captain, which takes at least 14 complete years of service in the AAF. That means that officers such as CPPOs usually have a good record and extensive experience as regular army officers in either the infantry, artillery, tank or pioneer (engineer) regiments before they start their scientific education.

The organisation of CPP in the AAF

In compliance with Article 7 (Military Measures) and Article 25 (Dissemination) of the 1954 Hague Convention and Second Protocol, Article 30/2 and 3 (Dissemination), the AAF select appropriate personnel and organise a programme of training for CPPOs. Only militia (reserve) officers are trained as CPPOs; no regular officers are trained for this role. Staff selected are usually high-achieving personnel with experience in education and teaching, frequently with a knowledge of history, (especially international) law, art and cultural affairs. However, those with specialist skills such as structural engineering are also identified. Crucially, all potential CPPOs must have an aptitude for tact and diplomacy in their dealings with other people – especially colleagues in other ministries and organisations.

Functions

In 1981 the MoD issued, for the first time, a special directive concerning the 1954 Hague Convention for the AAF ('Richtlinien für den Kulturgüterschutz') which was replaced by a new and more detailed directive in 1993. Referring to Articles 7 and 25 of the 1954 Convention, it focused on three main functions/tasks of a CPPO:

- Securing and keeping respect for cultural property as assistants/advisers and specialists of their command and commanders (eg to give information about property in the area, distance of troops and weapons from cultural property etc)
- Providing for and delivering training and instruction programmes for troops and their commanders
- Maintaining contact with civilian authorities (such as the Department for Monuments, churches, monasteries, province and district authorities etc) and with various individual persons

Training and career of a CPPO

After at least 14 years of service with the AAF and having attained the rank of Captain, an officer selected to become a CPPO will undertake a basic one-week CPP course. During subsequent years of service a CPPO will complete an annual one-week course as part of their continuing CPP education and training. After at least four years of service as a CPPO and, finally, after having completed a five-week staff course, a CPPO will be promoted to the rank of Major. A CPPO must then pursue a specialised military academic curriculum in a relevant discipline and write a thesis. On completing the curriculum and thesis and after at least ten further years of service a CPPO is promoted to Colonel. While pursuing their career CPPOs will hold training seminars for civil experts and soldiers and develop expertise in special functions (eg languages). The highest ranked CPPO in the AAF is a Brigadier General in the MoD. In other words, it takes at least 14 years to become a CPPO Major, 24 years to become a Lt Colonel, and 28 years' service to become a Colonel.

Since 1995, and running parallel to the above national training programmes for CPPOs, a number of international training seminars have taken place in cooperation with the NATO-PfP (Partnership for Peace) programme. Austrian CPPOs and civil experts from relevant NGOs (Austrian Society for the Protection of Cultural Property and Austrian National Committee of the Blue Shield) have joined international seminars of ICRC and UNESCO around the globe as special CPP advisers.

Organisation

Since 1981 the MoD has assigned two CPPOs to each territorial/provincial command (one of whom is of academic level – ie Colonel) and the other at a lower rank. Beginning in 1989, a gradual process of reform and reorganisation has led to an increase in the number of CPPOs and their focus has extended to include more international activity. There were one or two CPPOs deployed at each provincial/territorial command; four CPPOs in the Austrian International Operations Command (AUTINT); two in Air Force Command; and five in MoD (Defence Staff Bureau/expert pool and Joint Command and Control Staff).

Following the implementation of the Second Protocol and the ongoing reform of the AAF (so-called 'AAF reform 2010'), a significant amount of CPP policy is still under review. It is currently planned to introduce a CPPO within each of the recently established mobile regional brigades. It is also planned to transfer the CPP conception and education unit to the National Defence Academy. These developments build on the success of the previous 20 years, which have seen the production of a number of special instructions and a manual for CPPOs.

MANUAL FOR THE CPPO

The Manual identifies the Responsibilities of a CPPO:

- The CPPO is a member of the staff at the level of a territorial command (Federal Province), division and higher.

- The CPPO is adviser to his commander in all matters relating to the respect for cultural property within a commander's responsibilities in training, preparing for and executing military actions, as well as in cases of military assistance in times of natural disasters (in conjunction with the law and constitution of the country).
- The CPPO prepares lists and information about the amount and priority of cultural property in the operational area. He contributes to the operational assessment of the military situation, which ultimately results in the production of a military report. He gives information to his commander, the liaison officers and to the district/province authorities. He drafts orders guaranteeing respect for cultural property, taking into consideration the tactical decisions of the commander. By order of his commander he controls in critical areas the tactical measures concerning respect for, and protection of, cultural property.
- The CPPO remains in contact with the Head of the Department of Monuments of the Federal Province and with his senior military colleagues.
- The CPPO is adviser and consultant for civil authorities concerning the effects and results of military operations on cultural property and he gives instructions about the possibility of safeguarding cultural property when and where civil authorities do not, or cannot, do this.
- As a member of senior staff one of the main and most important functions of the CPPO is to provide situation reports.

CPPO situation reports should include: an overview presentation of cultural property in the operational area; a short presentation of the essence of the 1954 Hague Convention and its Protocols; a short presentation of the content of the Instructions of the MoD concerning the 1954 Convention and consequences of military actions for cultural property in the operational area; suggestions and provisions for protecting cultural property during military operational planning. In order to produce such a report CPPOs have to collect special material and equipment over the years and these materials form their basic documents. CPPOs are expected to amass a set of basic material – the 'mobile office box' – including:

- Copies of the 1954 *Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict* and its Second Protocol (1999), 1972 Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage, GENEVA CONVENTIONS (and Additional Protocols) and International Red Cross Handbook
- guides to libraries and documentation archives, museums, private and public collections
- workbook with a collection of papers, documents and information material concerning the protection of cultural property
- set of special maps of cultural property (cultural property maps) of the area [today replaced by GIS tools]

- general map of the country [today replaced by GIS tools]
- records (address books and telephone numbers, offices and authorities name of contact persons) to secure contact (already in times of peace) with: the superior command; the territorial organisation and authorities (provincial government etc); the head of cultural departments (monument section etc) in the ministry; fire brigade, private aid organisations
- office material (typewriter/computer, paper, writing and drawing utensils)

Last but not least, the CPPO should have their own designated transport.

In summary, the main functions and tasks of the CPPO are to be an adviser and consultant for his commander, a teacher and trainer for officers and troops, and a contact person and liaison officer to civil authorities and civilians.

In accordance with the 1954 Convention, to meet the requirement for flexibility and the responsibility to provide the military command with all necessary information in the shortest time available, an EDP-supported cultural property databank was developed in the late 1980s (in the Military Command of Lower Austria/Federal Province of Austria). This model has been based on the regional code system of the Austrian Office for Statistics in conjunction with a special object code. Owing to the huge number of objects to be processed, for the initial general identification we used the district and community codes of the Office for Statistics. For exact military/operational identification, the local CPPO added the military grid code used in military maps.

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS

Civil sector

The FBMS has just completed the new registers required by the 2000 *Monument Protection Act*. After considerable discussion the number of objects in the registers was reduced dramatically. Compared with the old register, started in 1968 and finished in the 1980s, which included some 50,000 objects, the new register comprises only some 145 entries. However, this reduction in the number of objects masks a change of paradigm in the approach taken to registration: the old register was based on a single object protection system; in the new register most of the 145 objects are ensembles or areas enclosing a large number of single objects (eg the World Heritage area of the City of Vienna).

Military sector

As many years have passed since the last directive for the protection of cultural property was issued by the Austrian Federal Ministry of Defence in 1993, and since the Second Protocol to the Convention was drafted in 1999, a new military directive on cultural property protection was overdue; it was recently released in January 2010. Owing to the fact that a national system will not be very efficient in future international activities, it has been designed to be compatible within projects involving

international cooperation. Therefore, the new directive, in addition to all necessary references to the Second Protocol, also contains a chapter on CIMIC as well as on the peculiarities of peace support operations. These new horizons of internationalisation also affect personnel structure and management, as reflected by the new special term 'Liaison Officer: Military Cultural Property Protection' (officially replacing the term 'Cultural Property Protection Officer') and by the establishment of an additional expert pool as a widened personnel basis for military cultural property protection in Austria in general and for international missions in particular.

A further development is taking place with respect to CPP in the context of military disaster relief missions. Natural disaster relief has always played a special and crucial role for the AAF since the draft of the National Defence Law 1920, and this aspect of AAF's duties was also stressed when the AAF was being re-established after World War II in 1955. CPP has always played an important role within AAF disaster relief owing to the history and geography of the country and the kinds of natural disaster to which it is prone, such as regular floods in the Danube river valley, where important historical cities are situated. This has also affected AAF's international missions under UN mandate since the AAF took part in the Congo mission in 1960. Nevertheless, it was not before the disaster relief mission to Calabritto (Southern Italy) in 1980 that CPP became a crucial aspect of such an Austrian disaster relief mission. Against the backdrop of these experiences the AAF Disaster Relief Unit (AFDRU) – designed exclusively for disaster relief abroad – was established in 1990 and CPP has been an integral aspect of planning ever since. Today, CPP is about to become an explicit component within AFDRU and the creation of CPPOs within the unit is planned.

BIBLIOGRAPHY AND REFERENCES

- Boylan, P J, 1995 *Review of the Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict* (The Hague Convention of 1954), UNESCO Document CLT.93/WS/12, Paris
- Büchel, R, 2007 Zusammenarbeit von zivilen und militärischen Stellen im schweizerischen Kulturgüterschutz (KGS), *Forum Kulturgüterschutz* 10, 4–9
- Büchel, R, and Schüpbach, H (eds), 2004 *Bewahren – Sichern – Respektieren: Kulturgüterschutz in der Schweiz*, Schweizerische Eidgenossenschaft, Bern
- Carcione, M, 2007 Il punto di vista delle ONG internazionali, *Forum Kulturgüterschutz* 10, 62–7
- Carcione, M, and Marcheggiano, A (eds), 1997 *La protezione dei beni culturali nei conflitti armati e nelle calamità*, Milano
- Chamberlain, K, 2004 *War and Cultural Heritage: An Analysis of the Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict and its two Protocols*, Institute of Art & Law, Leicester
- Desch, T, 1999 *Revision der Haager Konvention zum Schutz von Kulturgut bei bewaffneten Konflikten 1954 – wozu?* Österreichische Gesellschaft für Kulturgüterschutz, Vienna
- Deutsches Rotes Kreuz (ed), 1988 Die Genfer Rotkreuzabkommen vom 12. August 1949 und

- die Zusatzprotokolle vom 8. Juni 1977 sowie das Abkommen betreffend die Gesetze und Gebräuche des Landkrieges vom 18. Oktober 1907 und Anlage (Haager Landkriegsordnung), Bonn
- Dutli, M T, Bourke Matignoni, J, and Gaundreau, J, 2002 *Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict*, Report on the Meeting of Experts, 5–6 October 2000, Geneva
- Eichberger, H, and Schipper, F, 2009 The Protection of Cultural Heritage in Times of Armed Conflict – a View from Civil–Military Cooperation, paper presented at the WAC *Inter-Congress in Ramallah*, 9–10 August 2009, Ramallah
- Fechner, F, Oppermann, T, and Prott, L V, 1996 *Prinzipien des Kulturgüterschutzes*, Duncker & Humblot, Berlin
- Fiedler, W, and Turner, S, 2003 *Bibliographie zum Recht des Internationalen Kulturgüterschutzes*, Walter de Gruyter, Berlin
- Foramitti, H, 1970 *Kulturgüterschutz. Empfehlungen zur praktischen Durchführung*, Böhlau, Vienna
- Frank, E, and Teschner, W, 2003 *Haager Konvention, Kurzkomentar zum Zweiten Protokoll sowie wichtige Annexvorschriften*, Vienna
- García Labajo, E, 1995 La protección de bienes culturales en caso de conflicto armado, *Revista Española de Derecho Militar* 65, 457–74
- Gooren, R, 2007 Civil–Military Cooperation in Protecting Cultural Heritage, *Forum Kulturgüterschutz* 10, 50–54
- Habsburg-Lothringen, K von, and Schipper, F, 2009 Archaeology in Conflict – The 'Blue Shield' Perspective, paper presented at the WAC *Inter-Congress in Ramallah*, 9–10 August 2009, Ramallah
- Henckaerts, J-M, 1999 New Rules for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict, *International Review of the Red Cross* 835, 593–620
- Hladik, J, 2000 Reporting System under the 1954 Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict, *International Review of the Red Cross* 840, 1001–16
- Hladik, J, 2007 Aspects civils et militaires, *Forum Kulturgüterschutz* 10, 29–33
- Horn, D, 2008 Militärischer Kulturgüterschutz im Österreichischen Bundesheer: Neuregelung, paper presented at the annual course for Cultural Property Protection Officers of the Austrian Armed Forces, 27 October 2008, Reichenau/Rax
- Hostettler, P, 2007 KGS als Bestandteil des Kriegsvölkerrechts, *Forum Kulturgüterschutz* 10, 10–17
- Kasselman, H J, 2009 Herausforderungen für den Schutz von Kulturgut im Rahmen von Operationen der NATO, paper presented on the occasion of the re-establishment of the Austrian National Committee of the Blue Shield, 8 June 2009, Vienna
- Menegazzi, C (ed), 2004 *Cultural Heritage Disaster Preparedness and Response*, ICOM, Paris
- Micewski, E, and Sladek, G (eds), 2002 *Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict: A Challenge in Peace Support Operations*, Austrian Armed Forces Printing Office, Vienna
- Mihaila, M, 2007 Approche de la Société Roumaine pour la Protection des Biens Culturels en matière de droit international humanitaire, *Forum Kulturgüterschutz* 11, 78–83
- Neuwirth, F, 1999 Changes in Legal Implementation of the Hague Convention by the Amendment to the Austrian Monument Protection Act (Federal Law Gazette I no.170/1999), unpublished paper, Vienna
- Nowicki, J, and Sałaciński, K, 2004 *Cultural Heritage in the Face of Threats in War and Peace Time*, Wydawnictwo SBP, Warsaw

- Pesendorfer, M, and Speckner, H, 2006 Operation 'Pallas Athena': The Protection of Cultural Property in Peace Support Operations, handbook of the *International Workshop on the Protection of Cultural Property in Peace Support Operations*, 19–23 June, Bregenz, Austrian Armed Forces, Vienna
- Pesendorfer, M, and Speckner, H, 2007 Kulturgüterschutz in (friedensunterstützenden) Krisenbewältigungs-Operationen, *Forum Kulturgüterschutz* 10, 34–41
- Pignatelly y Meca, F, 2001 El segundo Protocolo de la Convencion de 1954 para la proteccion de los bienes culturales en caso de conflicto armado, hecho en La Haya el 26 de marzo de 1999, *Revista Espanola de Derecho Militar* 77, 357–441
- Prem, H J, 2002 *Zur Entwicklung des Kulturgüterschutzes in Österreich. Ambivalente Erfahrungen eines Kulturgüterschutzoffiziers im Österreichischen Bundesheer*, Vienna
- Redl, K, and Sladek, G (eds), 1996 *Die grenzüberschreitende Verantwortung des Kulturgüterschutzes*, Bregenz – Vienna
- Reichelt, G (ed), 1992 *Internationaler Kulturgüterschutz*, Vienna
- Roye, I, and Blazeby, G (eds), 2001 *Implementation of International Humanitarian Law and Cultural Heritage Law*, Pretoria
- Savane, Y, 2007 Pour une collaboration entre militaires et civils dans la protection des biens culturels en cas de conflit armé, *Forum Kulturgüterschutz* 10, 42–9
- Schipper, F, 2009 Kulturgüterschutz darf kein Zufall sein, *Global View* 3, 28
- Schuller, F, 2007 Die Rolle von NGOs im KGS am Beispiel der Österreichischen Gesellschaft für Kulturgüterschutz (ÖGKGS), *Forum Kulturgüterschutz* 10, 55–61
- Schüpbach, H (ed), 2003 *Kulturgüterschutz betrifft uns alle*, Bern
- Schüpbach, H, 2007 Militärische Maßnahmen und Institutionen in der Schweiz mit KGS-Bezug, *Forum Kulturgüterschutz* 10, 18–22
- Sénéchaud, F (ICRC), 2007 Instruction des troupes avant des opérations internationales, *Forum Kulturgüterschutz* 10, 68–74
- Sladek, G (ed), 1993 *Das kulturelle Erbe im Risiko der Modernität*, Vienna
- Sladek, G (ed), 1995 *Kulturgüterschutz: Ein Aufruf zu transnationaler Aktion*, Vienna
- Sladek, G (ed), 2008 *Kulturelles Erbe – Vermächtnis und Auftrag*, Klagenfurt, Vienna
- Speckner, H, 2001 *Command Post Exercise (CPX) Montfort 2001*, Handbook, Austrian Armed Forces, Bregenz
- Toman, J, 1996 *The Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict*, UNESCO, Paris
- Toman, J, 2007 La protection des biens culturels: un devoir de tous, *Forum Kulturgüterschutz* 11, 43–59