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1. Introductory remarks

Having determined, in accordance with Article 39 of the UN Charter, that the ‘unlawful destruction of cultural heritage, and the looting and smuggling of cultural property in the event of armed conflicts’ constitute a threat to international peace and security, the UN Security Council unanimously adopted Resolution 2347 on 24 March 2017, the culmination of an initiative launched by France and Italy. While the Security Council had already expressed concerns and condemnations with regard to those issues in past resolutions, this Resolution is unique as it is the first dedicated exclusively to the destruction and trafficking of cultural heritage in situations of armed conflict in general and at the hands of terrorist groups in particular. This is significant as it means that attacks against cultural heritage are now considered on a similar level as other threats to international peace, which have also been addressed with specific resolutions, such as the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction or arms trafficking.¹ At the Security Council briefing on Resolution 2347, which took place under British presidency, Ambassador Peter Wilson underlined the need to respond to cultural

¹ Dorset Senior Research Fellow in Public International Law at the British Institute of International and Comparative Law.

¹ See, for example, UNSC Res 1540 (28 April 2004) UN Doc S/RES/1540, and UNSC Res 2117 (26 September 2013) UN Doc S/RES/2117. On the broadening of the concept of threats to peace and security, see, for example, S Urbinati, ‘Some Considerations on the Role of the Security Council in Facing the Ebola Outbreak’ in L Westra, J Gray, A D’Aloia (eds), The Common Good and Ecological Integrity (Routledge 2016) 131-132.
destruction ‘with the same intensity and the same unity of purpose as any other threat to international peace and security.’

This piece considers how the Security Council gradually established cultural heritage protection as a key element in the maintenance of international peace and security, including through its combat against terrorism financing. Considering the wider context of escalated attacks against cultural heritage in armed conflict, it analyses Resolution 2347 in parallel with other key documents adopted at the international level and provides some initial findings as to the impact it has generated so far.

2. Cultural heritage protection in armed conflict: A growing concern for the UNSC

In past resolutions, the Security Council had generally considered cultural heritage in relation to country-specific situations of armed conflicts. In 1999, the Security Council called for ‘respect for Afghanistan’s cultural and historical heritage’, while also expressing its concern over the control of certain areas of the country’s territory by the Taliban.

In 2003, following the Iraq invasion, the Security Council stressed ‘the need for respect for the archaeological, historical, cultural, and religious heritage of Iraq, and for the continued protection of archaeological, historical, cultural, and religious sites, museums, libraries, and monuments’ and called on States ‘to facilitate the safe return to Iraqi institutions of Iraqi cultural property and other items of archaeological, historical, cultural, rare scientific and religious importance illegally re-


\(^3\) Professor Roger O’Keefe delivered the Annual Harry Weinrebe lecture at the British Institute of International and Comparative Law on 30 November 2015 on this topic, highlighting the growing attention paid to attacks against cultural property within efforts at the maintenance of international peace and security, considering in particular the work of the Security Council but also the General Assembly, among others.

moved from the Iraq National Museum, the National Library, and other locations in Iraq [...] and to prohibit ‘trade in or transfer of such items’, which led to the adoption of import bans specifically concerned with cultural goods at the domestic level. The need to respect the cultural heritage of Iraq was again mentioned in a Security Council resolution on the transitional measures endorsing the Interim Government in Iraq in 2004, without specifying particular measures to be taken with regard to cultural heritage.

In 2012, in relation to threats to peace and security in Mali, the Security Council strongly condemned ‘the desecration, damage and destruction of sites of holy, historic and cultural significance, especially but not exclusively those designated UNESCO World Heritage sites, including in the city of Timbuktu’. It also stressed that attacks against cultural buildings might constitute violations of international law.

With the adoption of Resolution 2100 (2013), the Security Council went further by extending the mandate of the United Nations Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in Mali (MINUSMA) to ‘support for cultural preservation’ by assisting the transitional authorities in protecting the heritage sites (‘as necessary and feasible’ and ‘in collaboration with UNESCO’), adding that it must ‘operate mindfully in the vicinity’ of cultural sites.

---

5 UNSC Res 1483 (22 May 2003), UN Doc S/RES/1483 para 7.
6 For example, in the UK, this ban was implemented with the adoption of The Iraq (United Nations Sanctions) Order 2003 (Statutory Instruments 2000/1519), which states that ‘[T]he importation or exportation of any item of illegally removed Iraqi cultural property is prohibited.’ See Section 8 of the Order <www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/ 2003/1519/contents/made>. Note that trade sanctions with regard to all Iraqi goods, including cultural goods, had already been imposed under UNSC resolution 661 (1990), see P Gerstenblith, ‘From Bamiyan to Baghdad: Warfare and the Preservation of Cultural Heritage at the Beginning of the 21st Century’ (2006) 37 Georgetown J Int’l L 245 (2006) fn 158 and 329-334 on implementation of UNSC resolution 1483 in the United states, United Kingdom, and Switzerland.
7 UNSC Res 1546 (8 June 2004) UN Doc S/RES/1546.
10 UNSC Res 2100 (25 April 2013) UN Doc S/RES/2100, para 16 (d) (iv) (f).
of cultural and historical sites'.\textsuperscript{11} As a result of the positive experience with MINUSMA, UNESCO eventually adopted a resolution further supporting ‘efforts aimed at embedding the protection of cultural heritage and cultural diversity, where appropriate, in humanitarian action, global security strategies as approved by the United Nations and peace-building processes’,\textsuperscript{12} despite the political and practical difficulties associated with the engagement of so-called ‘Blue Helmets for Culture’.\textsuperscript{13}

In relation to Syria, where the civil war erupted in 2011, the Security Council raised its concern with regard to cultural heritage, albeit from 2014 onwards only, despite the EU having already adopted a specific import ban with regard to Syrian antiquities in 2013.\textsuperscript{14} It called on the parties to ‘save Syria’s rich societal mosaic and cultural heritage, and take appropriate steps to ensure the protection of Syria’s World Heritage Sites’ in a paragraph which also called on the parties to ‘end all violence which has led to human suffering in Syria’.\textsuperscript{15} In its Resolution 2170 (15 August 2014), the Security Council condemned again the groups, such as ISIL (Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant), for their destruction of cultural and religious sites. This was reiterated in 2015, with Resolution 2199 which again condemned the attacks of ISIL in Syria, as well as Iraq, against cultural heritage.\textsuperscript{16} Resolution 2199 also extended

\textsuperscript{11} ibid para 32. In his 2015 lecture (n 3), Professor O’Keefe added that the Security Council also authorised MINUSMA to use ‘all necessary means’ in carrying its mandate, which could then include the use of military force.


\textsuperscript{15} UNSC Res 2139 (22 February 2014) UN Doc S/RES/2139.

the prohibition of trade of cultural objects, already in place with regard to Iraq since 2003, to Syrian antiquities.

While the protection of cultural heritage in situations of armed conflict has been a growing concern for the Security Council over the past two decades, it has failed to recommend specific measures in the Libyan context, where cultural objects have also been the objects of deliberate attacks, or with regard to Yemen, where historic buildings have been bombed in the Old City of Sana’a, a site which was inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger in 2015, among others. The inconsistent approach of the Security Council towards the protection of cultural heritage during hostilities has, on occasion, been addressed by other bodies. For example, in relation to the adoption of import restrictions to curb the illicit trafficking in Iraqi and Syrian artefacts, UNESCO encouraged states to extend such measures to Yemeni and Libyan artefacts, event though the latter have not yet been given any attention by the Security Council, unlike the former.17

3. Establishing the link between antiquities trafficking and terrorism

In addition to addressing the destruction and loot of cultural heritage in general, the Security Council has also pinpointed the link between terrorism, one of the most serious threats to international peace and security, and the destruction of cultural heritage, which has become a regular target for ideological reasons; as mentioned above, the destruction of cultural heritage by ISIL was specifically condemned in Resolution 2199 (12 February 2015) with regard to Iraq and Syria,18 and again in Resolution 2249 (20 November 2015),19 which was primarily concerned with the series of terrorist attacks which occurred in Tunisia, Turkey, Lebanon, and Paris in 2015.

Furthermore, the looting of cultural objects has gradually been identified by the Security Council as a potential source of terrorism financing; it has thus also considered the trafficking in antiquities within

17 See the letter from the UNESCO Director-General, dated 18 May 2016, regarding the implementation of UNSC Res 2253 (17 December 2015) on sanctions for terrorist activities <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0024/002448/244857e.pdf>.
18 UNSC Res 2199 (12 February 2015), UN Doc S/RES/2199 para 15
the framework of its peace and security agenda. The Security Council first linked cultural heritage with terrorism in Resolution 1267 (1999), when it called the Taliban, with regard to the heritage of Afghanistan, to ‘ensure that the territory under its control is not used for terrorist installations and camps [...]’. While also mentioning terrorism financing and the need for States to ‘[F]reeze funds and other financial resources, including funds derived or generated from property owned or controlled directly or indirectly by the Taliban’, it however fell short, at the time, of specifically listing trafficking in cultural objects as a source of terrorism financing.

Following the September 2001 attacks on American soil, the Security Council noted a connection between international terrorism and the trafficking in items such as illicit drugs or arms, but not cultural objects specifically.\(^20\) It then also called on states to become parties to the now nearly universally ratified International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism (1999), which can apply with regard to funds raised with antiquities trafficking if those funds are used to support terrorist activities, even if this type of trafficking is not mentioned per se in the treaty. In its resolution concerned with the financing of Al-Qaeda and the related Sanctions List of individuals and entities associated with Al-Qaeda in 2011, the Security Council again specifically highlighted the proceeds of drugs trafficking but not of cultural objects.\(^21\) In its resolutions on Mali, although all were concerned with terrorist organisations, none made the link between antiquities trafficking and terrorism financing. The above mentioned Resolution 2170 (2014) on Syria also contained a section on terrorism financing but did not single out trafficking in cultural objects as a source of terrorism financing either.

In 2014, in a resolution concerned with terrorism in Africa, the Security Council expressed concern at terrorists benefiting from transnational organized crimes including trafficking in artefacts.\(^22\) However, although it called on Member States to ratify a number of Conventions, such as the Convention against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances (1988) or the Convention against Transnation-

\(^{22}\) UNSC Res 2195 (19 December 2014) UN Doc S/RES/2195 Preamble.
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... among others, it did not include conventions concerned specifically with the illicit trade in cultural objects, such as the UNESCO Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property (1970, UNESCO Convention).

In 2015, with the adoption of the already mentioned Resolution 2199, the Security Council clearly affirmed the link between trafficking in cultural objects and terrorism financing as it noted that terrorist groups ‘are generating income from engaging directly or indirectly in the looting and smuggling of cultural heritage items from archaeological sites, museums, libraries, archives, and other sites in Iraq and Syria, which is being used to support their recruitment efforts and strengthen their operational capability to organize and carry out terrorist attacks’.

This Resolution also reaffirmed the Security Council’s 2003 decision to call on all Member States to take steps ‘to prevent the trade in Iraqi and Syrian cultural property and other items of archaeological, historical, cultural, rare scientific, and religious importance illegally removed from Iraq since 6 August 1990 and from Syria since 15 March 2011, including by prohibiting cross-border trade in such items, thereby allowing for their eventual safe return to the Iraqi and Syrian people’ and called upon UNESCO, Interpol and other organisations to assist in implementing this decision.

According to Irina Bokova, UNESCO Director-General, Resolution 2199 has already generated positive results, in particular with the strengthening of domestic legislation and cooperation through information-sharing to counter the illicit trafficking in antiquities.

---

23 ibid para 3.
25 ibid para 17 (and see para 7 of resolution 1483 (n 5)). This was again reiterated in UNSC Res 2253 (17 December 2015) UN Doc S/RES/2253 Preamble, which highlighted the targeted destruction of religious sites and objects in Iraq and Syria by ISIL and ANF in particular. The Annex to this resolution also required the Monitoring Team to report on the impact of the measures in UNSC Res 2199 (2015) regarding the trade in cultural property, see Annex I (a)(iii). The first report is due by 31 December 2017. This was again reiterated in UNSC Res 2368 (20 Jul 2017) UN Doc S/RES/2368.
26 Intervention of Ms Bokova at the Security Council briefing meeting, UN Doc S/PV.7907 (24 March 2017) 4, where she underlined that about 50 States have already strengthened their legislation and are sharing information to fight the illicit trafficking in antiquities.
In 2016, through Resolution 2322, the Security Council further expressed its concern over the growing involvement of terrorist groups in the trafficking in cultural property and underlined the role of international cooperation in preventing such crime.\textsuperscript{27}

4. Affirming cultural heritage protection as a priority on the international agenda

Resolution 2347 is thus not the first time the Security Council addresses the destruction and loot of cultural heritage.\textsuperscript{28} However, by dedicating an entire resolution on this topic, it affirms the protection of cultural heritage as a key means for the maintenance of international peace and security. It also underlines that addressing the trafficking in cultural objects is a legitimate part of the UN counterterrorism regime, strengthening the role of the Security Council with regard to the prevention of terrorism and extremism, a role which has grown significantly since the 2001 September attacks. When explaining the US vote in favour of Resolution 2347, Ambassador Michele J. Sison singled out Abu Sayyaf, a now deceased high-ranking ISIL official, for illicitly trading in antiquities to finance terrorism.\textsuperscript{29} The broad support for the Resolution, which was unanimously adopted by the 15-Member Coun-

\textsuperscript{27} UNSC Res 2322 (12 December 2016) UN Doc S/RES/2322, Preamble. In this Resolution, the Security Council also urged states to develop, ‘with the assistance of UNODC and in close cooperation with UNESCO and INTERPOL, broad law enforcement and judicial cooperation in preventing and combating all forms and aspects of trafficking in cultural property and related offences that benefit or may benefit terrorist or terrorist groups, and to introduce effective national measures at the legislative and operational levels where appropriate, and in accordance with obligations and commitments under international and national instruments, to prevent and combat trafficking in cultural property and related offences, including considering to designate such activities that may benefit terrorist or terrorist groups, as a serious crime in accordance with article 2 of the UN convention against Transnational Organized Crime’ (para 12).

\textsuperscript{28} It recalls UNSC Res 1373 (2001) UN Doc S/RES/1373, which called on States to ‘prevent and suppress the financing of terrorist acts’.
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cil, reflects a global concern on the part of States which may be impacted as a point of origin, transit, or destination for illicitly exported cultural objects.

With regard to trafficking, Resolution 2347 highlights the efforts of the Council of Europe, which, less than two months later, on 3 May 2017, adopted the Convention on Offences relating to Cultural Property, which itself refers to the Resolution in its preamble.\(^{30}\) This Convention focuses on the criminalisation of the illicit trafficking in cultural objects while also requiring its state parties to criminalise the intentional destruction of cultural property, whether or not it has taken place in an armed conflict, thus extending the similar provisions contained in the Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in Armed Conflict (1954, the Hague Convention) and its Second Protocol (1999).

Furthermore, at the adoption of Resolution 2347, the UN Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs noted that the protection of cultural heritage ‘is not only a cultural issue, it is also a security and humanitarian imperative’,\(^{31}\) underlining that terrorists groups do not only ‘exploit cultural site to finance their activities’ but also ‘destroy and traffic cultural heritage to undermine the power of culture as a bridge between generations and people of different backgrounds and religions.’\(^{32}\) This statement resonates with the prosecution of Al-Mahdi, who was associated with Islamist militant groups and was condemned by the International Criminal Court to nine years in prison for having intentionally directed attacks against nine mausoleums and a mosque in Timbuktu, only a few months before this Resolution was adopted.\(^{33}\) Therefore, Resolution 2347 was deemed as not only aimed ‘to deprive terrorists of funding, but also to protect cultural heritage as a symbol of understanding and respect for all religions, beliefs and civilizations.’\(^{34}\)

\(^{30}\) Council of Europe Treaty Series no 221, also known as the Nikosia Convention, which now counts seven State parties.

\(^{31}\) Intervention of Mr Feltman, UN Doc S/PV.7907 (24 March 2017) 2-3. At the same meeting, Ms Irina Bokova echoed his words when she said that ‘defending cultural heritage is more than a cultural issue; it is a security imperative that cannot be separated from the protection of human lives’, ibid, 4.

\(^{32}\) Ibid 2-3.

\(^{33}\) The Prosecutor v. Ahmad Al Faqi Al Mahdi, ICC-01/12-01/15-171 (Judgment 27 September 2016) Trial Chamber VIII.

\(^{34}\) Intervention of Mr Feltman, UN Doc S/PV.7907 (24 March 2017) 2-3.
This Resolution also builds on the Abu Dhabi Declaration on Safeguarding Endangered Cultural Heritage (2016), which led to the creation of a fund dedicated to the protection of cultural heritage in armed conflict and sought the creation of a network of safe-havens. While the Resolution also encourages the creation of ‘safe havens’ to protect cultural heritage from conflicts, it limits their possible existence to the Member States’ ‘own territories’, in response to states such as Egypt that rejected the potential transfer of their heritage to another state.

While adopting a Security Council resolution focusing on cultural heritage must be lauded as a substantial step towards increased protection of cultural heritage from destruction and loot and thus reinforced efforts at maintaining (or restoring) peace and security, some shortcomings may nevertheless be noted therein. For example, while Resolution 2347 is the first Security Council resolution to recall a treaty specifically dedicated to trafficking in cultural objects, namely the UNESCO Convention, it does not encourage its ratification; it also fails to mention the UNIDROIT Convention on Stolen or Illegally Exported Cultural Objects (1995) to which only one permanent member of the Security Council is a party (China). Resolution 2347 only ‘encourages’ ratification of the Hague Convention, although countering the trafficking in antiquities would benefit from increased cooperation among States, which is also addressed in the UNESCO Convention, for example.

Resolution 2347 also recalls the Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage (2003) and the Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions (2005), among others. However, there is no clear reference to direct attacks

---


36 Note that France reported having designated a safe haven on its territory not only for its own cultural objects but also for those from other countries ‘upon request’, see Report of the Secretary-General on the implementation of Security Council Resolution 2347 (2017) UN Doc S/2017/969 (17 November 2017) para 84.

37 It is worth noting that the United Kingdom has ratified the 1954 Hague Convention a few months after the adoption of this Resolution.

38 para 6.
against intangible forms of cultural heritage; to the contrary, the Resolution deplores the ‘destruction of religious sites and artefacts, as well as the looting and smuggling of cultural property from archaeological sites, museums, libraries, archives and other sites’. This is in line with the UNESCO Declaration concerning the Intentional Destruction of Cultural Heritage (2003) which, although recognising cultural heritage as a component of cultural identity and making the link between the destruction of heritage and possible adverse consequences for human rights, referred heavily to the Hague Convention, as well as the Additional Protocols to the Geneva Conventions (1977), which are concerned exclusively with the protection of tangible manifestations of cultural heritage in armed conflict. However, in her report on the intentional destruction of cultural heritage, the Special Rapporteur in the field of cultural rights underlined the link between tangible and intangible cultural heritage and the fact that an attack on one is often associated with an attack on the other. For example, the destruction of a cultural site may in turn challenge the fulfilment of the right to freedom of religion and worship, which may amount to intimidating a population. Nevertheless, in Resolution 2347, the Security Council notes that the destruction of cultural heritage is also an attempt to deny historical roots and cultural diversity, thus making the link between the destruction and smuggling of tangible heritage with human rights, even if only implicitly. Furthermore, it also states that the destruction and loot of cultural heritage may undermine not only peace and security but also the ‘social, economic and cultural development of affected States’. However, it still falls short of clearly connecting the destruction and loot of tangible cultural heritage with human rights’ violations, which can also amount to threats against peace and security.

39 Note that in Resolution 2170 (15 August 2014) UN Doc S/RES/2170, the Security Council had called on states to prevent the subversion of cultural institutions by terrorists and their supporters, which thus appeared to be concerned with intangible forms of culture and possibly cultural heritage (para 6).
42 UNSC Resolution 2347 (24 March 2017) UN Doc S/RES/2347 Preamble.
Finally, while States ‘agree to accept and carry out the decisions of the Security Council’, the language of a resolution must be considered when assessing its possible binding effect. Like many UN Security Council resolutions, Resolution 2347 does not contain many legally binding obligations, with most of its paragraphs using terms such as ‘encourages’, ‘calls upon’ or ‘urges’, among others. With regard to states, it only requests them ‘to take appropriate steps to prevent and counter the illicit trade and trafficking’ in cultural objects ‘where States have a reasonable suspicion that the items originate from a context of armed conflict’. While this recalls previous resolutions which contained similar provision with regard to objects originating from Iraq and Syria, it extends this request to all situations of armed conflict, thus including Libya or Yemen, for example.

So far, 29 Member States, along with a number of international governmental and nongovernmental bodies, have submitted reports with regard to the implementation of the Resolution. While it is still early days to evaluate in a comprehensive manner the impact of Resolution 2347, a few developments can be noted, such as the creation of specialized units or the integration of heritage personnel within police and customs authorities, for example, the provision of training to its police and customs officials, or the development of improved databases for information collection and sharing, as well as strengthened international cooperation. While some increased efforts have been reported in order to combat terrorism financing, through the sharing of information regarding individuals involved in illegal financing through the trade in an-

---

43 In accordance with art 25 UN Charter.
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However, no new legal measures have so far been adopted to criminalise the trafficking in cultural goods. In addition, a number of reporting states have not yet established comprehensive national inventories. In sum, the report summarising the implementation of Resolution 2347 does not reveal a great deal in terms of implementation and serves, rather, as a stock-taking exercise against which future developments in the field of cultural heritage protection can be measured.

Interestingly, the report includes more than just States, international organisations and NGOs, as it refers to a number of non-state actors, considering the role of collectors, art dealers, auction houses and online platforms as ‘last line of defence against the sale of artefacts looted by terrorist organizations in conflict zones’, as well as the establishment of ‘differentiated due diligence’ for the various participants in the art market. Finally, it also indicates a number of educational and awareness programmes aimed at civil society in general. Therefore, although the full extent to which this Resolution will be implemented remains to be seen, it is clear that a number of its provisions, including those of a non-legally binding nature, are already being implemented.

Furthermore, it is worth noting that Resolution 2347 has also garnered additional support such as through the adoption of a declaration by the G7 countries in March 2017, in Florence. Resolution 2347 has also already been quoted in two subsequent resolutions on terrorism (Resolution 2367 (2017) on ‘The situation concerning Iraq’ which focuses on terrorism and Resolution 2368 (2017) on ‘Threats to international peace and security caused by terrorist acts’), further underlining that the destruction and looting of cultural heritage has become an intrinsic part of counterterrorism efforts. Resolution 2379, which creates a team to hold ISIL members individually accountable, specifically condemns the destruction of cultural heritage and trafficking in cultural objects. The International Criminal Court (ICC) Prosecutor has also continued its efforts to hold accountable those responsible for deliberate

---

49 However, no listing request has so far been proposed, see para 48.
50 Ibid paras 22-23.
51 Ibid para 39. Interestingly, the report does note the inventory of intangible heritage in Mali, para 45.
52 Ibid paras 29, 33-38.
54 Ibid para 3.
attacks against cultural heritage.\textsuperscript{55} In line with the Resolution calls for increased cooperation, the ICC and UNESCO signed, on 6 November 2017, a letter of intent to support the establishment of a comprehensive cooperation agreement on the protection of cultural heritage in the future, for example through the provision, by UNESCO, of cultural heritage expertise to the ICC.\textsuperscript{56} At the European Union level, a new set of rules have been proposed by the Commission in July 2017 in order to strengthen its import system to counter the trafficking in cultural goods; its explanatory memorandum mentions both terrorism financing and Resolution 2347 as reasons for their adoption.\textsuperscript{57}

5. Concluding remarks

This interest for the protection of cultural heritage at the international level must continue to be supported. Amongst the 55 cultural sites with UNESCO ‘World Heritage’ status which have been placed on the List of World Heritage in Danger, 38 are cultural sites and the majority of those are at risk because of an armed conflict.\textsuperscript{58} This indicates only the tip of the iceberg in terms of cultural heritage at risk as it does not account for those sites not inscribed on the UNESCO list or for any moveable objects, such as antiquities.

\textsuperscript{55} See for example her speech at an UNGA side event in September 2017.

Note that the ICC Office of the Prosecutor’s new policy initiative on cultural heritage is scheduled for finalization and adoption in 2018. Note that in 2016, UNESCO and the International Committee of the Red Cross adopted a memorandum of understanding, aimed at integrating the protection of cultural heritage in humanitarian operations.


\textsuperscript{58} According to the Report of the Secretary-General on the implementation of Security Council Resolution 2347 (2017) UN Doc S/2017/969 (17 November 2017) para 4, ‘[O]ut of the 82 UNESCO World Heritage properties in the Arab States region, 17 are inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger owing to armed conflict.’
By singling out attacks against cultural heritage in a specific resolution, the Security Council has affirmed the protection of cultural heritage, not only as a means to counter-terrorism, but also as a means to protect a ‘priceless inheritance for future generations’. In her address before the Security Council, the first ever by a UNESCO Director-General, Irina Bokova further highlighted the link between the protection of cultural heritage and the protection of human lives, adding that ‘[W]eapons are not enough to defeat violent extremism. Building peace requires culture also; it requires education, prevention, and the transmission of heritage. This is the message of this historic resolution’, a message which will hopefully continue to resonate within the legal and policy community, at both the international and domestic levels, so that it adopts all feasible means, including through increased cooperation, to curb attacks against cultural heritage and thus supports peace and security for future generations.


60 Intervention of Ms Bokova, UN Doc S/PV.7907 (24 March 2017) 4.