BULLDOZERS IN THE DESERT: THE FRAMING OF CULTURAL HERITAGE DESTRUCTION IN PALMYRA IN 2015

by

Morgan Cloud

A Thesis
Submitted to the
Graduate Faculty
of
George Mason University
in Partial Fulfillment of
The Requirements for the Degrees
of
Master of Science
Conflict Analysis and Resolution
Master of Arts
Conflict Resolution and Mediterranean Security

Committee:

_____ Chair of Committee

_____

_____

_____ Graduate Program Director

_____ Dean, School for Conflict Analysis and Resolution

Date: _____ Fall Semester 2016
George Mason University
Fairfax, VA
University of Malta
Valletta, Malta

Bulldozers in the Desert: The Framing of Cultural Heritage Destruction in Palmyra in 2015

A Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science at George Mason University, and the degree of Master of Arts at the University of Malta

by

Morgan Cloud
Bachelor of Arts
Longwood University, 2014

Director: Sara Cobb, Professor
School of Conflict Analysis and Resolution, George Mason University

Fall Semester 2016
George Mason University
Fairfax, VA
University of Malta
Valletta, Malta

DEDICATION

To my late grandfather, James H Cloud, whose love of history and humanity inspire me each day. I would love to share this experience with him.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First I would like to thank my thesis supervisor, Dr. Sara Cobb, whose guidance enabled me to craft a topic and a thesis which I love. My professors and mentors in this program have all been sublime, and their knowledge and support have allowed this group and myself to flourish in the program, and I extend so much thanks to them all, especially Thanos Gatsias. Thanks also to my family and my incredible friends here in Malta and abroad. I am incredibly fortunate to have had their encouragement and love throughout this process.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Islamic State of Iraq and Syria ..... ISIS
Cultural Heritage Destruction ..... CHD
United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization ..... UNESCO
United Nations ..... UN
United Kingdom ..... UK

ABSTRACT

BULLDOZERS IN THE DESERT: THE FRAMING OF CULTURAL HERITAGE DESTRUCTION IN PALMYRA IN 2015

Morgan Cloud, M.A. M.S

George Mason University, 2016

Thesis Supervisor: Dr. Sara Cobb

This thesis examines the history and prevalence of the destruction of cultural property during armed conflict and analyzes the way media frames are used to make sense of and define that destruction. The thesis uses Robert Entman's Frame definition to look at a set of framing categories, based on previous research, to determine how they are used, and how they interact. Specifically, this analysis will use the case of ISIS and its destructive episode in the Syrian city of Palmyra in the second half of 2015. It examines the legal frameworks employed to combat it in order to discern how this phenomenon is conceptualized during armed conflict. These definitions necessitate different responses and are important to understand in the way the public and international institutions come to understand this phenomenon and its relationship to war.

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

The symbols used to capture and define humanity's history have intrigued and inspired countless generations of people. These symbols, some of them material, are the representations of a group's psychological connection to an area and reflect the culture. With the development of anthropology and archaeology as scientific fields during the 19th and 20th centuries, as well as the increase in a new form of armed conflict and the destabilizing effect of population growth in much of the world, we have seen the discussion of our cultural heritage and its loss becoming increasingly prominent in warfare and peacetime discussion. However, determining what exactly this means is challenging both in and outside of academia, legislation and popular discourse. The heritage of cultures, and its material manifestations and artifacts, is a topic which involves peoples across the world, and is not a modern construction, with the protection and veneration of these places and artifacts going back millennia.

However, interactions between cultural heritage and armed conflict go deep through the subtleties of today's war mechanisms, that which deal with identity politics, terrorism, illicit trade of artifacts and funding of armed groups. The loss of cultural property in conflict can leave groups without a connection to their history and group identity. This has been exemplified on many occasions and its impact continues to grow

as other factors help to propel destruction. The victims of armed conflict are therefore not only humans, but human histories and human cultures.

In 2001, the destruction of the Bamiyan Buddhas in Afghanistan ushered in a renewed proliferation of destruction in the Middle East and today, with the rise of the self-declared Islamic State we are seeing this happen on a tremendous scale as the group expands at exceptional speeds, leaving in their wake the ruins of churches, mosques, schools, and villages, in their brutal state-building experiment. This has become a prominent source of worldwide condemnation and narratives of tragedy and loss, but how we identify what the concept of Cultural Heritage and the implications of its destruction are has yet to be fully examined. As this thesis will explore, cultural heritage plays a role in armed conflict, mobilized as a political tool and destroyed in the expression of ideology, weaponized against other groups and narratives.

Targeting of historical sites and the looting of cultural property is not a new phenomenon. From antiquity through the twentieth century, many attempts have been made to curb this destruction, to varying degrees of success. Yet a wave of cultural heritage destruction of in Europe during the Franco-Prussian War prompted a loud international outcry. This led to the 1874 International Regulations on the Laws and Customs of War, the Brussels Declaration. This set an international precedent on preventing wartime destruction and further legislation on the subject, but the reaction to the destruction seen in the world wars and the conflicts thereafter brought about continued legislation and discussion on the protection of cultural heritage during armed

conflict. The 1954 Hague Convention and the development of UNESCO brought this concept into the mainstream, yet during the decades that followed, continued destruction took place most every place there was war. The bombing of the city of Dubrovnik during the wars in Yugoslavia and the 2003 looting of the National Museum in Baghdad are only two of the examples of this violence which have caused the international community to reevaluate the way it conceptualizes and defines cultural heritage in the context of conflict.

The way cultural property is discussed by the perpetrators, victims, and outside players in conflict, in reaction to this destruction, is important in understanding the justifications, causes, and dynamics which play a role in this type of violence, against both the objects themselves and those groups for whom they hold importance. However, terminology and framing in news narratives cast differing light on individual acts of destruction, with the ability and the power to either focus on or overlook certain acts.

The act of destroying ancient sites and cultural property in modern warfare generally takes on the same straightforward action regardless of the actors involved, and the immediate effect is roughly the same: a piece of irreplaceable cultural property has been demolished or irreparably damaged. The difference of course is the individuals or groups committing this destruction and how they and their acts are framed during and after the event. Governmental organizations and the news media we consume as readers and viewers play a crucial role in informing the way we make sense of actions happening both domestically, in our own lives, and abroad. Reports of cultural heritage destruction

in war, especially by an enemy group, must be processed and reacted to in accordance with our understanding of the situation in which it occurs, informing our behavior and our response.

The frames used in the creation of these destruction narratives both reflect and construct the norms associated with the act, therefore impacting official actions and legislation dealing with it. Robert Entman (1993) defines the role of frames in the news as to "select some aspects of a perceived reality and make them more salient in a communicating text, in such a way as to promote a particular problem definition, causal interpretation, moral evaluation, and/or treatment recommendation.(p. 52)" As these frames are shaped and reshaped, and conflicts change and adapt to different circumstances, we must reexamine the way these frames impact our definitions of cultural heritage and cultural property, and how that can in turn impact the way these issues are dealt with on a preventive or reactive scale. While there have been many discussions about what should be done about this destruction, there has not yet been analysis of the way we actually understand the concept of cultural heritage in this context, and when or by whom its destruction is justified, abhorred, and how we can react to it.

In the International Criminal Court case in Mali beginning earlier this year involving Ahmad al-Faqi al-Mahdi's charge of war-crimes in his participation in the destruction of religious sites in Timbuktu, we see a shift in our understanding of the value of cultural heritage, grouping its destruction in the same category as rape and murder.

There has been worldwide condemnation as well of the continued destruction of sites throughout the middle east by the ISIS, the topic of this dissertation. Alternately, actions by the US military in Iraq have caused immense damage to Babylon, a World Heritage site as equally as recognizable as Timbuktu, along with many others. However, no charges have been brought as in the case in Mali, and the destruction was rarely discussed. These distinctions and categories are formed in our collective understanding, and not all acts of destruction are treated or talked about in the same way.

This thesis will outline the history of this practice of destruction and look at the development of official mechanisms for dealing with cultural heritage destruction. This will help to illuminate the way our definition of cultural heritage has evolved in both scope and content over the last century and earlier, setting the stage for the current debate and looking at how we can examine and deal with it at different levels. This thesis aims to explore how the destruction of tangible cultural heritage is framed in policy and media discourse and how that impacts the ability of official mechanisms to deal with it. In order to build a framework for the discussion, I will outline the historical development of the concept of cultural heritage, in its relationship to armed conflict, as well as highlight the international legislation that has been enacted to address these challenges on an institutional level.

The second chapter will be an examination both of the history of cultural heritage destruction during armed conflict, and of the creation of international treaties and legislation which have evolved in response to it. More specifically, it will also look at the

creation of the 1954 Hague Convention on the Protection of Cultural Property during Armed Conflict and its two protocols, the comprehensive UNESCO legislation which acts as a framework for states responsibilities in the protection of cultural property, and lends its own interpretation to the concept and has been a focal point in this discussion in the past 50 years.

The third chapter will examine the rise and development of the Islamic State and their ideology, one which impacts their relationship to cultural heritage and their methods, along with how they present their actions to the world. As a central actor in the multiple conflicts currently underway in the Middle East and North Africa, along with terrorist campaigns throughout other regions, it is important to recognize the centrality of their mission in order to understand how they justify their actions and mobilize their destructive methods. The sites the group targets and the way they go about it highlight their ideas of cultural heritage and their methods of warfare. By using the modern case of ISIS, this thesis will seek to highlight the way this challenge is now understood in light of previous conflicts and events.

The fourth chapter will look at the way scholars and experts have interpreted different destructive episodes in the 20th and 21st centuries and the ways they occur- from mediatic extensions of a "scorched earth" destruction policy, to a transformative construction of new meanings for the heritage sites at risk. It will also examine the challenges, practical and theoretical of protecting and prioritizing heritage sites. For this

analysis I will focus on the tangible cultural heritage in Syria and the destruction of, or violence against them.

This thesis will utilize the methods of prominent researchers to begin to explore what the variety of conceptualizations are and how they are viewed. In order to look at how we define cultural heritage in the context of its intentional destruction, I will employ a qualitative frame analysis on news pieces dealing with the aftermath of ISIS' destructive actions and the loss of cultural heritage in Syria. This method should help make sense of how news outlets, the predominant source from where the public gets their information, makes sense of the loss of cultural heritage in the current context.

While at times the two terms seem interchangeable, I will be using both the phrase "Cultural Property" and "Cultural Heritage" in different situations throughout this piece. While I will delve deeper into the conceptual development of these two important terms later on, the definitions I will be using will be the following: Cultural Property encompasses the tangible material objects and physical buildings which are associated with or owned by a specific group and mobilized as symbols of their history or ethnic or group identity. It includes historical or artistic monuments, artifacts, archeological sites and books, manuscripts, art, and archives. This will be used in the discussion of specific damage to physical objects. Cultural Heritage encompasses the previous definition but includes the addition of the intangible aspects of a group, such as language, tradition, ceremonies, stories, and artistic endeavors, along with the historical memory that plays a huge part in the formation of their identity. These are all reinforced and by physical

representations and symbolic objects and places in which or with which traditions take place and history is formed. Another aspect of defining cultural heritage is making sense of culture itself. Detling, in her study of cultural heritage destruction in the former Yugoslavia, highlights a group's material culture heritage as anything which "communicates something about the people who possess it" (Detling, 1993). Thus, for the purposes of this thesis, this will be the understanding we employ.

This study will help to make sense of the way this prominent facet of contemporary conflict, the destruction and control of cultural property is made sense of in our collective definition, and allow us to consider how approaches to dealing with that type of violence are shaped by those understandings. In this case, the news narratives of destruction by ISIS can illustrate how our ideas are shaped by and shape this type of act and the approaches to contending it. For the field of conflict resolution, this is important, as it illuminates whether the mechanisms we employ to correct a violent situation deal directly with the issues as they are explained and experienced.

CHAPTER TWO: HISTORICAL BACKGROUND TO CHD

The phenomenon of cultural heritage destruction during armed conflict has occurred throughout history, with intentions, techniques, and justifications for the violence adapting to new social, cultural, and legal situations. The way the property was understood during those episodes can be revealed by what was done in reaction to it. This chapter will look at the historical background of this violence as well as attempts to stem it. It will look first at the early legislation and philosophical input on the subject, and then examine the creation and execution of the 1954 Hague Convention, which is the most comprehensive and widely recognized tools for protecting cultural property. The chapter will also look at the challenges and changes the Convention has encountered since its inception and discuss how this impacts the way we make sense of and define cultural property and consequently, how we, and members of the international community come to deal with the destruction.

Previous Legislation

In recognizing the historical precedent for the destruction of cultural property in conflict, we must first look at how that history has evolved over Bhat (2001) provides a chronological account of the changes which took place in societal understanding of cultural heritage sites in wartime. Defining them primarily in terms of significance to

religious communities, the first places to be deemed immune from the effects of war or necessary for protection were religious building and temples.

Beginning in ancient times there has been an attempt to stem wartime destruction of those structures which were seen as crucial to the spiritual existence of a people. The sacking and fall of Alexandria, Constantinople, Carthage and Many others left the world with fewer examples of the rich cultural and intellectual life that characterized those cities. As Greek and Roman campaigns focused increasingly on the complete destruction of enemy ways of life, destruction of temples and looting of anything of value, including art, materials and religious artifacts became the norm. It was expected that in order to thoroughly cripple the enemy's capabilities, an invading army must destroy the connection to their gods and goddesses (Bhat, 2001). At the same time, many recognized an inherent value in preserving the cultural property of their territory. Mesopotamia, what is affectionately referred to as the "cradle of civilization" encompasses an area that makes up what is now Iraq and Syria

In the first century BC, the philosopher and politician Cicero pleaded that warfare should leave public and private buildings, created for adornment or religious purposes, unharmed. While powerful, and early in recorded discourse on the matter, the plea went unheeded and the armies of classical times continued the practice of wanton destruction and looting for both the enrichment of their own state and for the annihilation of their adversaries. Throughout the continued destruction of these places in times of war, there have been numerous attempts to change this practice and impacted the importance placed

on sites. Numerous religious and humanist principles held that in times of war, religious buildings and their surroundings should be left unscathed. St. Augustine, in his 10th century work, 'Truce of God' warned against looting and destroying places of worship. (Howe, 2012)

Creating a framework for protection in war

In order to understand the importance that has been place on cultural heritage in the international community we must look at the ways its destruction has been addressed through legislative and judicial means. As international bodies, who are in themselves centers of power, define and set the agenda for the importance of cultural heritage, it impacts the way in which society views both the sites and the violent activities doing them damage. The 18th century brought new realizations to the world of law and legislation in Europe to address this devastation. Bhat argues that Emerich de Vattel, a Swiss philosopher and legal expert, set the stage for international regulation and legislation of cultural heritage destruction and in his groundbreaking work *The Law of Nations,* which set the stage for modern international relations and the practice of international law. In it, de Vattel insists that in wartime, an invading country can gain no advantage by destroying buildings and works of art, and to do so and deprive humanity of those things would render oneself an "enemy of mankind" (Bhat, 2001). This concept had far reaching implications in the field of international law.

Drawing from de Vattel's work, The Lieber Code of 1863, the first written attempt to codify the laws of war at the beginning of the American Civil War, declared in

its second section that buildings and sites relating to religion, art, education and science were of public property and could not be appropriated by an invading army. (Bhat, 2001) Articles 35 and 36, however gives permission of an international force to "rescue" objects in peril, stating: "If such works of art, libraries, collections, or instruments belonging to a hostile nation or government can be removed without injury, the ruler of the conquered state or nation may order them to be seized and removed for the benefit of the said nation. The ultimate ownership is to be settled by the ensuing treaty of peace. In no case shall they be sold or given away, if captured by the armies of the United States, nor shall they ever be privately appropriated, or wantonly destroyed or injured. (quoted in Boylan, 2001)." This sets a definition for what sites at that point were considered most vital in the cultural traditions of a nation or group, its artistic endeavors, educational establishments and scientific ambitions, intangible concepts attached to physical pieces of property.

Numerous codes in other nations attempted to tackle this issue as well, in many of the same ways, declaring those sites off-limits to bombardment and seizure by invading forces. In 1874, public outcry stemming from the destruction of the cathedral and library of Strasbourg during the Franco-Prussian war in the years preceding led to the creation of the Brussels Declaration of the International Regulations on the Laws and Customs of War. This first international attempt at regulating the rules of warfare provided that "all seizure or destruction of, or willful damage to, institutions dedicated to religion, charity and education, the arts and sciences', historic monuments, works of art and science should be made subject of legal proceedings by the competent authorities" (Vrdoljak,

Criminalization, 2015). The Oxford Manual (1880) reflects a similar approach to this act, solidifying definitions and leading to The Hague Convention s of 1899 and 1907, all laying out the groundwork for a prohibition on the destruction of cultural property. (Bhat, 2001) In moving toward a framework for the protection of cultural property, Roger O'Keefe (2007) argues that the violence against cultural property in armed conflict slowed significantly from the 18th and 19th centuries and that historical episodes of systematic destruction by warring armies were exceptional circumstances rather than as the norm. This represents not only an apparent success of the conventional laws listed above, but a shift in cultural regard for these objects. As widespread state-level condemnation for the looting and malicious destruction of cultural property began in response to the devastating occurrences, militaries had to make large considerations for their tactics in battle. (O'Keefe, 2007) However this shift reversed once again in the bloody first half of the 20th century.

Despite the widely regarded prohibitions on destruction and the international community's emphasis on their importance to humanity, the First and Second World Wars did not bring an end to this type of violence, and shocked the world with the levels of genocidal destruction. Along with the devastation which occurred in Hiroshima and Nagasaki which punctuated the Allies' Pacific campaign, the bombings of Reims Cathedral in WWI and the historic city of Dresden in East Germany in WWII highlighted the shortcomings of the treaties in both scope and implementation. It also highlighted that any group can use this method to further their war efforts and demoralize their enemy. The controversial bombardments by Allied forces left tens of thousands of civilians dead

and destroyed sites and buildings which did not house or support any of the German war-effort. (Auwera, 2012,) But despite, many episodes in the second war showed that there was an attempt on all parts to uphold many of the ideals of the previous Convention s and policies. For example, Allied bombings specifically avoided cultural sites in Rome, Florence, and Kyoto until the last seconds of the war, and inspired by the British campaign in North Africa, the US specifically employed "Monuments, Fine Arts and Archives ("MFA&A") officers" throughout Europe, with the intention of advising commanders on the care and location of cultural property in the region. (O'Keefe, 2007).

But in the aftermath of WWII, with the devastation of countless other monuments and cities, on top of the near annihilation of entire cultures and religious groups and the death of millions still fresh in the minds of world, the international community sought to prevent another war through the creation of the United Nations. Recognizing that the victims of conflict can be made of more than flesh and blood, the charter for the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, UNESCO was signed, pledging in its constitution to conserve "the world's inheritance of books, works of art and monuments of history and science" and to work with individual nations in the creation and implementation of international legislation to deal with this. (Drazewska, 2015)

A significant step at this point was the Genocide Convention of 9 December 1948 which defined genocide, as the world had witnessed extensively during the Second World War and declared that 'genocide, whether committed in time of peace or time of war, is a

crime under international law which they undertake to prevent and punish' (Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide 1948). The Convention defined genocide in its second article: **"**In the present Convention , genocide means any of the following acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group, as such: Killing members of the group; Causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group; Deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part; Imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group; Forcibly transferring children of the group to another group." (Convention on Genocide, Article 2). This definition provided a basis for bringing to justice those acts which had devastated many groups and communities in the years which preceded, and in many since. Yet, at final drafting, the parties excluded a provision dealing with "cultural genocide" as a definition discreet from the others, meaning that the participation in this destruction would not constitute a war crime as significant (Drazewska, 2015).

The Hague Convention

The primary goal of UNESCO was to stress the moral imperative of states to protect and conserve their cultural heritage and bring about a new chance to address these challenges. In 1954, with the help of the Dutch government, the freshly-formed organization created the Convention on the Protection of Cultural Property during Armed Conflict, known today as the 1954 Hague Convention, a text which has guided and informed most subsequent legislation on the subject. The significance of this step

codified the connection of cultural heritage to conflict, and attempted to lay out a plan for how to go about addressing several key aspects of that relationship.

Article 3 of the text stipulated the creation of peacetime protection plans and special military units dedicated to the prevention of their damage or destruction. It emphasized a commitment towards "Respect for cultural property situated within their own territory as well as within the territory of other States Parties by refraining from any use of the property and its immediate surroundings or of the appliances in use for its protection for purposes likely to expose it to destruction or damage in the event of armed conflict; and by refraining from any act of hostility directed against such property" (Hague Convention , 1954). This article however does not specify exactly which measures should be taken, leaving interpretation up to the state party, with a failure of that provision at the state's expense, but with accountability to the international community.

At the same time the First Additional Protocol was added to establish a process for preventing the export or looting of cultural objects in war. In light of the widespread pillaging of art from museums and private collections by the Nazis during WWII, The Hague Convention sought to prevent this. In this protocol, High Contracting Parties had the obligation to return cultural objects to the High Contracting State from which they were taken and prevent the looting of property as war reparations, as well as preventing exportation of cultural property from occupied territory (Protocol to the Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict, 1954.) the first

protocol has been widely disregarded however, and there have been very few examples prior to the current conflict which have seen state parties attempting to restrict the flow of illicit art into their markets (Howe, 2012). Prioritizing the economic value cultural property can have in this context an effect of defining it in terms only of its economic impact and value.

Yet, despite these issues, this work was the first international Convention to deal exclusively with cultural property in armed conflict and has been the core framework for defining state parties' obligations to their own and their opponents' cultural heritage: state parties "undertake to prepare in time of peace for the safeguarding of cultural property situated within their own territory against the foreseeable effects of an armed conflict, by taking such measures as they consider appropriate" (Art. 3). With this article, the Convention prepares states for the inevitability of this type of violence and encourages them to act in a proactive, rather than reactive way to prevent damage. This comes for many in the form of National Committees of the Blue Shield stipulating the need for Article 6: "cultural property may bear a distinctive emblem so as to facilitate its recognition", the Blue Shield emblem. The marking, a blue and white symbol in the shape of a shield could be used to mark generally immovable property and the personnel protecting it. (Article 17)

The Convention also provides that while general protection applies to all cultural property, State parties may apply for special protection for refuges housing movable cultural heritage, provided it is not also used for military purposes. While ambitious, the

vagueness of its definitions makes this document challenging in its interpretation, and the creation and implementation of it however proved problematic and the number of states to fully ratify the Convention. Less than half of the UN member states have fully ratified the Convention, with fourteen only accepting the main text, and excluding one or both additional protocol (Boylan, 2001). While the number has improved, the difficulty presented by three of the five permanent members of the UNSC - UK, US and China - to ratify the Convention s earlier limits its authority in the international arena.

In a 1970 conference, UNESCO took the definition a step further, tying the protection of cultural heritage (no longer officially employing the term "cultural property") to fundamental human rights and stressed the humanitarian significance of the concept, that destruction of this type has a strong impact on communities and their ability to recover (Auwera, 2013). With this shift, the international community recognized cultural property as an integral component of heritage, and pushed for the study and preservation of culture and history of a group or region. However, Prott and O'Keefe (1992) stress that the ideological underpinnings of the concept of cultural property and property law focus on ownership, and the placing of value on the rights of the possessor. In legislating secular property, ownership is the key framework. In this way, the monetary value is a key aspect in our understanding of the concept, determining how priceless a piece of heritage is when it is lost, or how much its looting can contribute to the financing of armed groups. The shift to understanding cultural property as cultural heritage is particularly significant in this argument, as it strongly addresses the connection to culture, and to individual cultures and their history and unique traits, which

the concept of cultural property alone cannot. This move signifies a change in the official understanding of cultural heritage, and moves it from the realm of secular property, to one which recognizes the intangible significance attributed to property in conflict (Prott and O'Keefe, 1992).

Drazewska (2015) explains further on the reaffirmation of this concept in legislation "Article 53 of the 1977 Additional Protocol I and Article 16 of Additional Protocol II to the Geneva Convention s of 1949 also sought to provide a higher standard of protection to historic monuments, works of art or places of worship which constitute the cultural or spiritual heritage of peoples, prohibiting acts of hostility and reprisals toward such heritage and outlawing its use in support of the military effort" (Drsazewska, 2015). Other legislation dealt with Cultural Heritage Destruction included the 1970 UNESCO Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property, and the 1972 Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage.

However, the events of the 1990s during both the Iraqi occupation of Kuwait and the aftermath of the wars in Yugoslavia, challenged the abilities of The Hague Convention, and the framework came under the critical microscope for the first time during the International Criminal Tribunal for Yugoslavia (Balcells, 2015).

The ICTY and Impact on The Hague Convention

The events of the 1990s challenged the legal conceptions of The Hague Convention , and for the first time came under the microscope during both the Iraqi

occupation of Kuwait the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia beginning in 1993. The outcome of this process led to the revisit of the Convention and the creation of the Second Additional Protocol in 1999. Karen Detling (1993) examines the aspects of psychological warfare that were employed against groups during the extended period of war in Yugoslavia, sieges and bombardments of the Croatian cities of Vukovar and Dubrovnik, a World Heritage city, which led many to question the extent to which the Convention could even be applied.

While shelling and bombardments had occurred throughout the conflict, a large attack on Dubrovnik constituted one of the greatest losses of cultural property in the war. Aimed directly at the historic Old Town, a UNESCO World Heritage City, the bombings on December 6, 1991 saw the damage of churches, monasteries, multiple Baroque era palaces, a mosque and a synagogue. The iconic buildings of Dubrovnik were damaged severely by projectiles and sacred buildings were looted and destroyed (Balcells, 2015; Herscher, 2002).

Cultural heritage of all sides and parties to the conflict in the former Yugoslavia were destroyed during this time, predominantly the spiritual centers - mosques, synagogues, churches and cemeteries- of the groups involved, but also the destruction of "symbols of peaceful coexistence" (Drazewska, p. 213) such as the Mostar Bridge and the Sarajevo Library. In this case, Drazewska argues that this that these acts were employed in order to erase the history of cooperation and cohesion. That the books of the Sarajevo library, which included collections of Muslim, Croatian, and Serbian literature

and history, were burned, in this case highlight the strategic intent of the groups involved in order to erase the connections to history and demoralize the opposing groups (Drazewska, 2015).

After the destruction which occurred in the region in the early 1990s, The ICTY listed destruction of cultural property in its Statute drawing inspiration from the 1954 Hague Convention for its Article 3, giving it the ability to prosecute individuals for "wanton destruction of cities, towns or villages, or devastation not justified by military necessity; attack, or bombardment, by whatever means, of undefended towns, villages, dwellings, or buildings; seizure of, destruction or willful damage done to institutions dedicated to religion, charity and education, the arts and sciences, historic monuments and works of art and $_{\text{science}}$". The statute does not use the term *cultural heritage,* yet succinctly summarizes what it entails, prioritizing the property for the value to the people involved in the conflict, those directly impacted by the violence in the years prior. In subsequent cases, the trial chamber reemphasized its connection to the 1954 Convention and the conceptual understanding of national cultural heritage, heritage of *peoples* rather than of *all peoples.*

The ICTY connected the destruction of cultural heritage to genocidal intent and considered that "where there is physical or biological destruction there are often simultaneous attacks on the cultural and religious property and symbols of the targeted group as well, attacks which may legitimately be considered as evidence of an intent to physically destroy the group (Drazewska, 216)." allowing for that connection to the

Genocide Convention and recognizing the cultural property as heritage integral to the formation and continuation of a cultural, religious, or ethnic group, while intuitive, represents a great leap in the conceptualization of the issue as a whole and pushes forward the understanding of the destruction as a tactic in war.

The International Committee of the Red Cross lays out some important changes and additions to this legislation as it examines the relationship between destruction of heritage and International humanitarian law. First, the two Additional Protocols for The Hague Convention (adopted in 1954 and 1999 respectively) made several clarifications. Given that the original Convention dealt mostly with the aftermath of WWII, in which entire cities were by air strikes and bombardments launched between the powers, and it was clear by the 1990s at the drafting of the Second Protocol that that scope was no longer relevant. While the main actors in armed conflicts had been state or governmental powers for centuries prior, this modern model of conflict has seen new forms emerge, ones which had not been considered in 1954.

The Hague Convention provides that cultural property can be targeted only in cases of "imperative military necessity", but the AP2 pushes this one step further, requiring that there must be clearly defined military objectives and the property has, "by its function, been made into military objective" to warrant such an attack, and only as a very last resort, when all other options have been surpassed. (Hague Convention Additional Protocol Two, 1999) The largest supplement which the second protocol provides is a further-reaching scheme of enhanced protection for cultural property, under

three conditions: “ (1) the property "is cultural heritage of the greatest importance for humanity;" (2) the property "is protected by adequate domestic legal and administrative measures . . . ensuring the highest level of protection;" and (3) the property is "not used for military purposes or to shield military sites and a declaration has been made by the Party which has control over the cultural property, confirming that it will not be so used." (Howe, 2012) This is a shift from the earlier requirements for enhanced protection, given to refuges which shelter cultural objects and works of art, and could, therefore, be expanded to all cultural property. Thus the second protocol expands and further globalizes the definition of cultural heritage.

This expansion on the understanding of cultural property is also evident in the deeper criminalization for its destruction as laid out in Article 15 the Second Protocol. The requirement is for state parties to criminalize under their domestic law the following acts: “(1) making cultural property under enhanced protection the object of attack; (2) using cultural property under enhanced protection or its immediate surroundings in support of military action; (3) extensive destruction or appropriation of protected cultural property; (4) making protected cultural property the object of attack (Second Protocol, Art. 15).” This push for a deeper relationship between humanitarian law and cultural heritage destruction (in tying destruction of culture with destruction of people) emphasizes a shift in the prioritization and recognition of the act.

This Protocol also contributed to the creation of the International Committee of the Blue Shield, (ICBS), in 1999, an international body whose approaches deal with

protecting cultural property in both natural and man-made catastrophes. This group brings the scope of destruction outside that of solely conflict-related destruction, which allows it to incorporate non-military responses and the deployment of civilian professionals to prepare states on a national level for the threats against cultural property (Drazewska, 2015).

Despite the continuous growth and expansion of this legislation, coming to rest on a universal understanding of cultural heritage in the context of its destruction, as well as preventing further violence to it, it has not been entirely successful.

The Challenges of UNESCO

As Ekern et al (2012) outline, UNESCO's intentions to create a solution to the issue of cultural heritage destruction in armed conflict have not been met with simple solutions when confronted with challenges in its definition and interaction with local populations. A challenge lies in the dichotomy between prioritizing the rights of a people, economic social and cultural versus prioritizing the rights of all people to enjoy the sites considered to be formative in the heritage of mankind. (Ekern et al, 2012) This "world heritage" is meant to have special significance to not only a whole people, but every group of people, having "outstanding universal value from the point of view of history, art, or science (Detling, 1993, note 32)."

This debate leads to a challenge between Cultural Nationalism and Cultural Internationalism. While recognizing a piece of cultural heritage as being intrinsically

linked to the identity of a specific group which created or possessed it, (Detling, 1993) the responsibility to conserve and protect falls in that group. The creation of international norms and laws, especially those which deal with defining a topic as broad as heritage or culture can create a challenging situation reinforces an internationalist perspective, and the inherently political nature of UNESCO must work along these lines. The internationalist approach also necessitates the prioritizing of certain objects and places over others in terms of their relative importance to the "cultural heritage of every people (1954 Hague Convention)" International Law such as the Hague Convention establish the criteria as well as the value of certain properties over others and define the most important as being "severable from its nation of origin (Detling, 1993)", and belonging to the world as a whole. Because of this, cultural property is most useful in study and the gaining of information, deprioritizing the context of the community it was retrieved from. An example of this interpretation of heritage can be found in the case of Lord Elgin's removal of a collection of marble friezes from the Parthenon in Athens for study and permanent display in the British Museum. The diplomatic and intellectual row over where the friezes should be kept involves an array of arguments over ownership and heritage itself. The Greek government argues that the history of the marbles is Greek, they should be returned to the Athens. However, the director of the British Museum has argued that they give the "maximum public benefit" by staying in the museum.

A nationalistic approach is employed by the Greeks in this case, in arguing that cultural heritage is best preserved and utilized in the context of the culture from where it has come. The cultural property provides a connection to the past and the heritage of that

group (Moustakalis, 1988). While this example does not deal with direct violence against cultural property, it highlights the tension between what groups value in their cultural heritage and how the global community makes sense of that. But the nationalist aspect of cultural heritage can also be problematic. In the 1954 Convention, State parties are the ones responsible for defining and protecting what they consider to be part of their national cultural heritage. Apart from concern that minority groups and their heritage could be excluded from the national narrative of history, states may have more resources to identify and capitalize on the cultural heritage which they designate. Yet this designation in conflict can also cause property to become targets of violence, by marking the sites as important to a group in the conflict

The 1954 Convention and its two Additional Protocols sit the between nationalist and internationalist interpretations. the preamble of the Convention refers to “the cultural heritage of all mankind” stating "damage to [any] cultural property ... means damage to the cultural heritage of all mankind, since each [group of] people makes its [own] contribution to the culture of the world", emphasizing that all cultural heritage fell under this distinction and calling for international response and protection. However, the additional protocols prohibit “acts of hostility directed against the historic monuments, works of art or places of worship which constitute the cultural or spiritual heritage of peoples.”, highlighting the national importance of specific sites rather than the heritage of the world as a whole. According to Auwera (2013), nine recommendations were adopted by UNESCO regarding the protection of cultural heritage between 1956 and 1980. All nine contained different variations of definitions for cultural property. The dominant

issue here is to address the incongruity of the definitions of cultural heritage and cultural property in different legislative texts, which has caused the concept to be vague. This ambiguity of definition and approach emphasizes the difficulty in reacting to this issue. The Hague Convention's first article defines its subject as "movable or immovable property of great importance to the cultural heritage of every people, such as monuments of architecture, art or history'. This initial definition sets an important baseline for the way it makes sense of cultural property at the time of its drafting. This first article defines the concept and expressly condemns its damage or destruction during armed conflict. Revisiting the concept of cultural internationalism, this definition emphasizes its importance to peoples of the entire world, prohibiting its damage in this context.

Contemporary Wars and the Destruction of Cultural Property

Despite continued calls to protect cultural heritage from violence, in the form of , contemporary armed conflicts did not see a reduction in this destruction. After the Second World War the paradigm shifted significantly from the Westphalian concept of interstate warfare to intra-state war, between armed groups rarely recognizable as the professional state-maintained armies of the 19th century and before. Mary Kaldor's (2012) concept of "new" and "old" wars outlines a new paradigm in contemporary conflict. While the logic of this dichotomy assumes a complete shift from the wars of the 20th century and before, her theory can help researchers understand the way war and conflict have adapted to the forces of modernity and globalization.

Kaldor essentializes the aspects of conflicts in the past two centuries to set a framework for analyzing them. The “old wars” of this theory are waged with the intention of broad changes within the realm of the state or in the international community. Through declaring and fighting a war, opposing groups assert their ideology or their geopolitical ambitions. Spreading this influence consists of capturing territory and fighting traditional militaries which are controlled and financed by states or state-like parties, making those ideologies state-level, such as the promotion of democracy or communism. The identities of those involved generally surround the political or national community, and can be utilized to shift people and ideas in a battle of national interests. In old wars, declarations and decisive moments, such as the invasion of Normandy in the Second World War, allow the conflicts to fit firmly on a timeline, with a clear beginning and end (Kaldor, 2012).

Contrary to Kaldor’s theory, figures from L.F. Richardson's *The Statistics of Deadly Quarrels* to conclude that the spread of internal and external conflicts were generally on par between 1820 and 1945 (112 to 137 respectively) (Boylan, 2001). While statistical figures of conflict in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries don’t conclude that this period was marked exclusively by the “old war” model that Kaldor lays out, it is certainly worth noting that this was the paradigm that the creators of the 1954 Hague Convention were using in their conceptualization of destruction and warfare, having come out of a conflict which led to the death of almost 30 million people.

New, contemporary, wars on the other hand are characterized by their protracted nature, lasting through years of waning and waxing episodes of violence. This shift separates conflict from the strong state institutions in both financing and control, and therefore the state no longer holds the monopoly on violence. Kaldor argues that this monopoly has been eroded through the creation of international frameworks and coalitions like the UN and legislation such as the Geneva Convention, which all sought to end this type of violence. How can the HC and its additional protocols, documents which lay out goals for protecting this sort of destruction, aspire to deal with it, out of the context of state parties? As we see this method of warfare continue to be used by non-state armed groups in the so-called "new wars" happening in the Middle East and North Africa, is the conceptualization sufficient in laying the groundwork for a solution?

In this framework, New Wars are financed through criminal activity and carried out by complex networks of state, state-like, and non-state actors. The goals of groups involved in this type of war have also shifted. Rather than the promotion of large scale ideologies by states, belligerents in New Wars have the aim of gaining access to those state level institutions for their generally underrepresented group. According to Auwera (2012) a main driver in this type of conflict is the mobilization of identity for political purposes, drawing groups together, and in conflict with one another based on common histories and cultures (whether real or manufactured), rather than simply by national allegiances. The exclusive nature of these identity groups can make brutality a strong marker in these new conflicts and push groups to find ways to strengthen their collective identity and to tie one's identity to a specific tradition or historical group is to create a

specific narrative of history which legitimizes not only a group's existence but their justification for violence towards the other. Rather than mobilizing identity as a tool to achieve greater ideological aims, New Wars make that political mobilization the goal. In the case explored in this thesis, the religious and ideological identity of ISIS, or their interpretation of it, is aggressively presented through their actions, and new forms of communication make that all the more possible.

This is where cultural heritage, in both the damaged and undamaged sense, plays a big role. (Auwera, 2012) Among other methods, dominant groups in a society are able to assert their particular narratives with the help of tangible cultural heritage as evidence for their stories, histories, traumas, and glories. Collective memory, facilitated by cultural property and its interpretation, helps to form collective identities and ideologies. The symbolic representation of cultural heritage thus becomes the identity of a group. Auwera characterizes these contemporary conflicts as identity-based conflicts where "[p]arties in a conflict try to attack the 'other' through the demolition or destruction of cultural property that reflects the identity of that 'other', or of a common identity. Destruction of cultural property can, in this vein, even be considered as an essential step in the process of ethnic cleansing, which aims at erasing entire communities in order to render territory homogeneous (Auwera, UNESCO p.4)." the psychological violence which characterizes this act should also be noted strategically, as a way to demoralize the enemy group. It is then that a group may rebuild with a revised narrative of history, without the bother of conflicting evidence of other versions of the same story.

In summary, armed conflict throughout history has nearly always included an aspect of cultural heritage destruction - historic cities, works of art, and monuments looted and intentionally damaged all across the globe. Pushback and condemnation of those actions occurred each time, but it wasn't until the 19th century that the international community began to try to address this problem on a large scale, through treaties and agreements. This, as we have seen, did not halt that destruction and the first half of the 20th century saw this practice at the extreme, through the inclusion of more advanced techniques and weaponry. But the first attempts to regulate it, the Brussels Convention and the Lieber Code, provided a framework on which to build international legislation, as well as international bodies like the United Nations and UNESCO. The primary example of this, the 1954 Hague Convention and its two protocols attempted to correct the issues of previous pieces and give states guidance to protect their cultural property.

However, in contemporary armed conflict, this piece has found issues and in the discussion of how to address destruction and what exactly defines the cultural heritage of groups, the Convention is caught between an internationalist and a nationalist approach. This is apparent in the ongoing conflicts involving non-state armed groups in the middle east, and no other group has been able to utilize the destruction in such a way as the Islamic State, as their violence in the Middle East against religious minorities and other groups has included the systematic destruction of historical and cultural sites, causing the international community to reconsider what their role should be in countering the group. It is important to then examine the background and ideological underpinning which drive

the actions of this type of group, as it can help to illuminate what drives this type of violence and what can be done to counter it.

CHAPTER THREE: THE IDEOLOGY AND RISE OF ISIS

The reach of The Hague Convention in the context of Kaldor's new wars, combining non-state actors, illicit crime, identity politics, ethnic violence and cultural heritage destruction is particularly challenging to decipher without looking at the conceptualization of cultural heritage by the non-state actors themselves. Chronicling the rise of non-state groups like ISIS and their role in contemporary conflicts highlights this shift. The events surrounding the rise of the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria and the methods they have used to gain traction in their expansion will showcase a specific episode moment in modern history, but one which is the result of a host of historical factors, reaching from the cultural development of the region and its complex interactions with outside actors in the previous decades. Their violence has left thousands dead or displaced in a region which has already been marked by the destabilizing effects of civil war and foreign occupation.

But their intentional destruction of objects and places which highlight and celebrate the history and culture of groups has left another black mark on this period. The group understands the importance placed on these objects and has used that understanding to their advantage, targeting them strategically in tandem with their humanitarian and broadcasting the destruction. They have, at the same time, made use of

cultural property in other ways, using it as a shield and incorporating excavations into their repertoire of damage in order to locate and sell artifacts on the global black market.

As the international community and local forces push back against this group, they must consider how this destruction has been executed and to what end, along with how this type of violence can be prevented in future conflicts. This brief chapter outlines the rise of ISIS and the spread of their influence over large areas of the MENA region, along with scholarly research into their ideology and strategy, which dictate their relationship with the cultural heritage of the regions they occupy. This chapter will also delve into their media branch, and how they have made use of social media and YouTube to present to the world their destructive acts and further their ideological reach to potential recruits outside of the region. This group has been referred to by several names, the Islamic State, ISIS, ISIL, and Daesh (the Arabic equivalent of the previous acronym). However, while my research includes the use of all of these acronyms and terms as search queries in the sourcing of articles, I will make use of the term ISIS (Islamic State of Iraq and Syria) in my discussion, as this is the most widely recognized.

The Islamic State of Iraq and Syria is a group which has, in the last several years, come to dominate international policy considerations in the Middle East. Their rapid expansion and conquest of a land area, nearly the size of The UK which is home to around 6.5 million residents has proven them a powerful and influential organization. Its membership estimates in 2015 ranged very broadly from between 9-18,000 fighters to 200,000 (Gartenstein-Ross, 2015; CFR, 2016). Pulling their fighting base from groups

already residing in the territory as well as foreign fighters from countries around the world, ISIS has been able to expand their reach and contend with both local and international forces. While the group's doctrine cannot be attributed to one particular individual or movement, it uses a blending of fundamentalist teachings and politically oriented goals to spread their beliefs and territorial control, with the aim of reestablishing the Muslim caliphate.

ISIS' religious ideology stems initially from their profession of a particular brand of Islamic teaching called Salafism, an early interpretation of Islam practiced and adopted by Saudi Arabia and in its most fundamental form, known as Wahhabism. Wahhabist clerics classify any religious practice which is not expressly sanctioned by the Quran as polytheistic, and therefore infidel, in a practice known as *bidah*. This includes the worship of God at graves and shrines or taking one's own interpretation of holy texts. Therefore, early practitioners of this ideology have a approach similar to that of this new group. During the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, according to the Gatestone Institute (2015), Wahhabist armies destroyed the tombs of many of the Prophet's family members and attempt to eradicate the physical history of non-Muslims as well as Shia. Wahhabi ideology provides that simply following its rules is not sufficient without the express rejection of non-Muslims and Muslims who do not follow its doctrine.

The Carnegie Endowment for international Peace also suggests that their views are shaped by Qutbism, an Islamic philosophy developed in the 1960s which suggests that western systems of religion and government were illegitimate and Islam is the sole

doctrine that will succeed, rejecting modern Muslim society and political systems and calling for a radical revolution based on Islamic supremacism.

The political origins of ISIS stem from the aftermath of the US invasion and occupation of Iraq in 2003. At that time, al-Qaeda aligned itself with forces faithful to a Jordanian militant Abu Musab al-Zarqawi to form a rebranded branch of the Islamist group, now called AQI (al-Qaeda in Iraq). According to the council on foreign relations, Zarqawi "sought to draw the United States into a sectarian civil war by attacking Shias and their holy sites, including the Imam al-Askari shrine in 2006, to provoke them to retaliate against Sunni civilians (Laub, 2016)" In Iraq, with the removal of Saddam Hussein by US forces in 2003, the Sunni minority essentially lost their official power in national politics, thoroughly stressing the political system and leaving a vacuum in which Zarqawi was able to spread his ideology (Hassan, 2016). According to the Carnegie Institute, a fissure between the leadership of Al-Qaeda and Zarqawi came in the form of their views on the Shia population. The aim of Al-Qaeda during the Iraq war positioned them directly against the West, and to have sectarian divisions and fighting within the Muslim community would detract from their goal. This has not been the case with the Islamic State's ideology (Hassan, 2016),

After the death of Zarqawi, in a US airstrike in June 2006, the group underwent more changes, remarketing itself as the Islamic State and increased its ambitions to move beyond the collapsed Iraq. The new and current leader, self-proclaimed caliph Abu Bakr

al-Baghdadi expanded the policy of destruction with hundreds of temples and heritage sites and thousands of lives lost. (Laub, 2016)

Zarqawi's following of Wahhabism pushed the group towards the adoption of *takfir,* the rejection and excommunication of fellow Muslims when declared an apostate or infidel, giving strong justification for sectarian targeting and violence against Shias and their cultural property (Hassan, 2016). The sectarian differences in both Syria and Iraq between the Shia and Sunni Muslim communities have made ISIS' spread more streamlined. In Syria, this tension helped to push the country toward civil war, as opposition Sunnis attempted to rise up against the Alawites, a smaller branch of Shia Islam in control of the government under President Bashar al-Assad. This has allowed ISIS to gain control of large areas of the country, now unprotected during the violence of a civil war.

ISIS presents itself under the umbrella of Salafism, specifically the Saudi brand known as Wahhabism, a traditionalist interpretation which takes the words of the Quran in their literal sense. The difference in ideology of the two groups is relatively small, but the divide is centuries old, dating back to soon after the Prophet Muhammad's death in the year 632. In the Oxford Dictionary of Islam, it is explained that different interpretations of religious authority and varying conceptions of religious practices are where most of the division lies. However, the sectarian opposition has been mobilized politically, and this group has been able to exploit these fissures to drive communities apart and pull fighters to their cause.

Destruction by ISIS

In 2014, the destruction of cultural heritage became a focal point in the discussion of ISIS and other Islamist groups, such as the Al-Nusra Front and Al-Shabaab. Since this time, the organization had undertaken a campaign of destruction against Islamic, Pre-Islamic, Christian and Yazidi shrines, churches, museums, and artifacts and sites, along with being responsible for the death and displacement of those living among and nearby the heritage. Since their inception, the group has bulldozed and sledgehammered historical artifacts and buildings, (for a more comprehensive list of heritage sites, see Ghorashi, 2015) justifying their actions with the religious mandates of Salafism and Wahhabism. However, it has been the destruction of UNESCO World Heritage Sites that have been aggressively presented and reacted to in the wider international community.

ISIS has been able to make use of the immense potential of the internet and social media in order to spread the effects of their destructive efforts. In carefully edited and published videos, the group has been able to present battles, beheadings, and destruction of shrines, temples and other cultural property, alongside cheerful depictions of everyday life under ISIS and info-graphic styled presentations of economic policy. Using their "in-house" media company, al-Hayat Media Centre, ISIS reaches a wide audience in the western world. With the prevalent use of social media and the internet to disseminate their images of destruction, along with the widespread availability of up to date information surrounding vulnerable sights, ISIS is able to utilize and work with the

collective repulsion that this act elicits. This new paradigm of violent presentation and action follows a "scorched-earth" military policy of livelihood and landscape annihilation. The acts of destruction themselves constitute part of this strategy, in both their effects on local populations and their ability to reach beyond them to a greater outside audience. Videos depicting the militants damaging pieces of architecture and cultural have become almost a routine part of their media presence. The presentation and re-presentation of destruction videos by the media and individuals in blogs and on *Twitter* and *Facebook* offers viewers a chance to engage with the destruction being shown. While the number sites destroyed are far greater than the few being shared in on social media, it is important to recognize the strategic value of this process (Harmanşah, 2015).

In May 2015, the group entered the ancient city of Palmyra and the surrounding modern town, after Syrian troops and many civilians fled. The significant site, which during the first centuries CE was a sprawling multicultural society held a large number of temples and other structures, which had been in use through a large part of its history by the local population in various incarnations. Declared a UNESCO World Heritage site, the city was located only a short distance away from the already heavily besieged city of Homs. While an initial statement by the group claimed that the ancient structures were not in danger, the situation soon turned, and on August 18th , the Syrian Archaeologist Khaled al-Asaad was decapitated, and his body displayed hanging from a street-light. During the 10 Month occupation, ISIS destroyed or severely damaged the Roman Arch of Triumph (constructed in the third century), the Canaanite Temple of Baalshamin (131 AD) and the Mesopotamian Temple of Baal (32 AD) (McLaughlin, 2016).

But the reaction to the destruction has not yet gone far beyond collective condemnation, unlike destructive episodes of previous conflicts, which led to the creation of binding treaties and law mechanisms. UNESCO chief Irina Bokova stressed that the "barbaric" destruction would have to come to an end for peace in the region because ISIS knows "if there is no identity, there is no memory, there is no history" (ISIS Destroying, 2014). The UN Security Council expressed a deep concern for the situation in 2014 and have continued to stress the provisions of the Hague Convention, but a large problem is how international legislation and protocols impact these types of conflict, and if they can ever address the drivers of contemporary warfare when they involve non-state groups and the destruction of culture?

The previous chapter looked into the development and the challenges of protecting cultural property in armed conflict using the 1954 Hague Convention, and this chapter examined the development of ISIS and their destructive campaign. The intersection of these two ideas lies at this question. Zoe Howe (2012) examines whether this legislation can be employed to deal with destruction by non-state actors in conflict. Previous conflicts in the region have proven that while non-state parties are not signatories to the Conventions and thus not subject to treaty law, they are still responsible to the customary international law which the convention is accepted as.

CHAPTER FOUR: LITERATURE ON DESTRUCTION

The concept of cultural heritage is imbued with aspects of a variety of intellectual concepts, which bring it and its destruction into a truly interdisciplinary realm, including art history, archaeology, conflict resolution, and political science. Because cultural heritage and its destruction have become such a mainstay of contemporary and historical warfare, many scholars have dealt with this issue, utilizing a variety of schools of thought in their explanations and discussions on this violence.

The International Institute for Conservation of historic and Artistic works identifies four ways in which cultural heritage can be impacted in conflict: "1- *Deterioration and weathering* due to lack of the needed sources and/or accessibility to maintain cultural properties 2- *Collateral damage due to military operations*, or intentional targeting once they are used as military bases. An example of this is the destruction of the minaret of the Umayyad Mosque in Aleppo after it became a base for the regime's snipers. 3- *Intentional targeting by groups* intending to damage the racial, national or religious symbols of others or to impose specific ideologies. This is the case of the destruction of shrines by the Islamic fundamentalist group ISIS in both of Iraq and Syria 4- *Illicit excavations and trade of antiquities by organised networks*, which often causes irreversible damage to the material culture, as in the case of the archaeological sites of southern Iraq and Syria. 5- *Use by people to survive the harsh conditions of war*.

For example, the Roman tombs of the dead cities of northern Syria are used as shelters by families who lost their houses in the conflict. Likewise, in Idlib, a governorate in Syria, 600 people are making a living by providing antiquity dealers with coins they find in their lands" (Lababidi, 2015, emphasis added) The type of destruction can have much of the same impact regardless of the type of violence leads to its destruction.

In order to lay the groundwork for this research, an understanding of the history and use of cultural heritage in warfare, both in actuality and as a concept must be understood. Architects Robert Bevan (2007) and Andrew Herscher's (2006, 2008) works on violence and the architecture of warfare in the former Yugoslavia shaped my initial interest in the targeting of cultural property in war. Having played a large role as a researcher and expert witness in the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia, Herscher carefully analyzed and identified the ways buildings had been targeted and the impact that targeting had on discourse. He utilizes the interpretive frameworks of architectural theory to try to uncover the process of destruction during the siege of Sarajevo. Focusing on cultural memory surrounding the ruinous aftermath of war, he reimagines the way construction and destruction are conceptualized.

In the discussion on the destruction of cultural heritage, and the impact it has on the social fabric of communities, few, apart from those archaeologists who work with threatened sites have consistently raised as much concern as those in the field of art history and architecture (Jas Elsner, Harmanşah, Flood, Bevan, Herscher). Architect and theorist, Andrew Herscher dissects the representational function of wartime destruction in

his study on the destruction of architecture in Sarajevo during the 1990s. As buildings are constructed to have purpose, so too can their destruction or damage lend meaning to a conflict. His concept of "warchitecture" brings to light the idea that attacks on civilian architecture, regarded as the cultural heritage of a group, does not always entail erasure. While the intention to erase the identity and culture of another group may still be present, Herscher's theory, which operates under a social constructivist view of architecture. Politicizing cultural heritage is a way to make sense of a group's own contested history and by intentional targeting and restoration of certain sites and buildings in war, helps to reinforce that political aspect, giving the space to justify violence and perpetuate conflict, in the formation of histories and heritage

In his theory, destruction is an act of re-formation which constructs new meanings and new identities for the cultural property. Herscher conceptualizes the material aspects of destruction of architecture, which are primarily dealt with through a non-architectural discourse, and tallied up, in an objective aftermath of conflict, focusing on the things lost and damaged and the specific perpetrator-victim narrative. In this way, Herscher argues that this separates culture from violence, making the common occurrence foreign and limiting the evaluative possibilities of the action. Importantly, Herscher argues that the identity or culture of a group is not inherent in an object or site, that this connection to that identity is only made in its destruction or targeting by another. It becomes the physical medium for the continuation of war as an ethnic conflict.

Robert Bevan explains this violence as “the destruction of the cultural artifacts of an enemy people or nation as a means of dominating, terrorizing, dividing or eradicating it. (Bevan, pg 7)” this explanation for the act of destroying cultural heritage makes it clear that destruction is not only a tool in the conflict but an objective, in erasing the groups or histories associated. In defining cultural heritage then, this understanding sees culture and identity as being held exclusively in the physical remnants of a group's history, tying the relationship exclusively to the communities directly associated with it, as opposed to a broader internationalist view of affecting the world’s common heritage. Erik Nemeth (2007) discusses the role of cultural heritage and art in regards to insurgent groups and the way illicit markets for art and artifacts fund violent activities abroad. This is an important aspect of the way cultural heritage and cultural property are presented, that objects become weapons themselves, and therefore a security challenge and party to the conflict. Nemeth elaborates on the political dimension of cultural heritage destruction that has evolved into the realm of ‘cultural security’, giving it a large role to play in international relations and conflict. For Nemeth, the destruction or exploitation of cultural property during armed conflict extends beyond the material gains (looting) or ideological assertions which are generally presented alongside that violence.

Through cataloging and studying sites of destruction and looting in the Sahara Desert, Jeremy Keenan (2005) explores the material, intellectual and social implications of cultural heritage destruction. Much of the cultural property in his study is of a vastly different nature than the sites in this thesis, but it emphasizes the scope of property which we assign value, and the extent to which the destruction or loss can have an impact. The

destructive actors - tourists, scientists and journalists - whose intentions and impacts he explores in his research, are primarily agents of globalization, rather than violent belligerents, but he argues that the consequences of damage to these sites is critical in the understanding of cultural heritage today because of its effect on both the ability to make sense of the past. Where law doesn't cover, or doesn't cover effectively, the protection of cultural property and heritage, significant damage can occur. The intellectual effects of the loss of cultural property prevents scientists from studying and analyzing, and producing information which can contribute to the understanding of history and cultural development in a region. Those insights are crucial in building an educational system which can function and support those in developing countries and the growth of cultural awareness and pride (Keenan, 2005).

In addressing recent destruction of cultural heritage in the Muslim world, Finbarr Barry Flood (2002) looks at discussion of the concept of iconoclasm and the ties made by scholars and politicians to historical episodes of similar nature in order to illuminate the problems with this approach. The explosive demolition of two massive stone Buddhas in the Bamiyan Valley of Afghanistan by the Taliban in early 2001 highlighted a renewed focus on the targeting of historical sites and world heritage. In Flood's explanation, there have been numerous examples of Islamic iconoclasm in classical and medieval art, pieces from throughout the Middle East and India in which the subjects have had their faces rubbed away or their eyes or throats physically punctured through to represent a neutralizing of their life-force and their agency (Flood, 2002). In this way, the pieces are not fully destroyed, but merely rendered harmless. Unlike this model, the chapter we are

seeing play out in this current crisis operates under a different set of rules. Flood indicates though that these occurrences happened not simply to the depictions made by members of other religious groups, but against art made by earlier fellow Muslims as well. In these classic examples “The aim is to render images powerless (quoted in Flood, 2002, endnote 55)”, rather than employ the image and its destruction for political, military, or economic goals.

However, Harmanşah argues that this current episode only uses this veil of “iconoclastic” action as an effective historical reference point. In Harmanşahs definition, “Iconoclasm is understood as a historically pervasive tactic of removing the animacy, agency, effective power, and present liveliness of images, and is attested in the history of all monotheistic religions, not just Islam” (Harmanşah, p126) If the religious power is not understood by the belligerents to be intrinsic in the object, as has been demonstrated through the callous disregard for the agency of the object, then the act is not iconoclasm. However, if one examines the power of the object in its importance to another group, that power can only be revealed or countered through its destruction, thus redefining cultural heritage as that which holds power in its loss, for a specific group of people. Flood (2002) argues that, in the most recent episodes that group is predominantly Western nations and their hegemony over the idea of internationalism and world culture and that the conception of culture, heritage, and history is a clear target in conflict

The scholarly debate around the significance of cultural heritage and the meaning and challenge of its protection in armed conflict underscore the challenges with how

organizations and governments can go about correcting the problem. The different definitions of the act, the actor, the victim and the justification behind it necessitate different approaches at addressing it, and as this thesis have laid out, that definition has changed over time and history. The conceptualization of this destruction as a whole - as iconoclastic anti-westernism, religious expression and erasure of the other, transformative creation-as-destruction, or a calculated tactic showcasing military prowess and control - is highlighted by the meaning that we attach to it in the public sphere.

CHAPTER FIVE: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND METHODOLOGY

In *Frames of War* Judith Butler examines the way we recognize and define what constitutes a life. By prioritizing certain actions and qualities over others, and by framing subjects as worthy or unworthy of consideration as full humans, our perceptions are manipulated and the outcomes leave subjects either "grievable" in their death or destruction, or unworthy of that grief. In her examination, Butler looks into this process and asks how the frames which shape our norms of recognizability are understood and how to "allocate recognition differently (Butler, p 6)". As the official definitions and recognition of cultural heritage has morphed and adapted over the centuries to today, it is important to reexamine how it is understood, as large events and conflicts, as we have seen, have the power to make us unconsciously reconsider how we make sense of this type of violence. This connection of the recognizability of life extends further to the destruction of cultural heritage, as we have seen widespread grief and condemnation in the aftermath of destruction (mourning the loss of history, identity, etc.) with journalists and academics questioning why this episode, in the midst of civil war and an incredible toll of human life, has had the power to provoke such an emotional response (see Cambanis, 2015).

To do this research, I will conduct a frame analysis of news pieces in response to destruction of cultural heritage sites by ISIS in the ongoing war in Syria, in the second

half of 2015 to illuminate the way narratives about Cultural Heritage destroyed in war is presented and how that destruction is defined. I will also attempt to draw connections to the 1954 Hague Convention, its conceptual definitions of this concept and the way it has been adapted in response to changes in practice and definition over time.

In communication studies, Walter Lippman was one of the earlier theorists to recognize the news media as possessing the power to give salience to certain issues and topics. For Lippman (1922), the news media provides the largest bank of information about the world to the common man or woman, and thus that information has the power to push their opinions and views in any convenient direction. Elites can change or present information in specific ways in order to push public opinion or policy in specific directions. In their coverage of major events, and the lack of coverage for others, media outlets and journalists set the agenda for what ideas become or continue to be relevant in the lives of those who consume that coverage.

Sociologist, Erving Goffman, developed a theory of framing in his 1974 work *Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organization of Experience.* Goffman describes frame analysis as a way to understand the cognitive and mental processes that help people to make sense and handle the realities of both difficult and everyday situations. As social agents, people must construct and compartmentalize information and stimuli in order to categorize and make sense of it based upon information they already hold. Frames help people to understand and make sense of different, and frequently difficult situations as well as dictate how an individual or group should behave.

According to Goffman (1974), the reality of a situation is shaped by an initial ideology which dictates how it will be understood based on both natural order and socially constructed rules. This first understanding about what is happening the main frame or primary framework. The primary framework helps to describe an event and give the event social meaning is acted upon through various processes and is based on established systems of rules or preconceived perceptions about a given event. There are four ways in which this initial understanding can be challenged or impacted, or as he puts it, "keyed", and later re-keyed. With each of these processes, the understanding is built upon and affects the way actors behave and act in response (Goffman, 1974).

Goffman's work on framing easily translated into the study of media effects, with later researchers employing the process of frame analysis to examine social and political issues and dissect the way the transfer of information, from news media, advertisements, speeches or works of art, exerts influence over the human consciousness and decision-making processes. Robert Entman builds upon Goffman's earlier work to add to the definition of framing and looks at the process of framing as "select some aspects of a perceived reality and make them more salient in a communicating text, in such a way as to promote a particular problem definition, causal interpretation, moral evaluation, and/or treatment recommendation". Because it has a large effect on the way pieces of information are noticed, categorized, interpreted and reacted to, the implications can be drastic. (Entman, 1993) The way events are selected and framed therefore has an impact on what responses are seen as appropriate and policy implications and official reactions.

While Goffman focuses on the processes which tool and retool frames of understanding about social processes and situations, Entman's attempts at a more straightforward analysis defines four loci which interact with frame creation and interpretation - communicator, text, receiver, and culture. The *communicator* is the agent which creates, either through a conscious process of selection or through unconscious reactions with previous frames and ideas. The *text* which contains the information is formed through keyword selection, phrasing, inclusion of images and intentional directing of the flow of information, and provides the reinforcement of previously set frames and judgements. Interpreting, and in a sense digesting, the information of the communicators text is the *receiver,* whose interpretation is guided by the frames presented therein, as well as common frames found in their social surroundings. However, depending on the respective *culture* of the receivers and communicators, the collection of frames wherefrom the actors pull their beliefs and common discourse, the frames' influence can either be ignored or interpreted differently from the intention.

In the case of this thesis, this is important to understand, as the conflict being discussed has implications and meaning for different groups, and involves actors from different regions and backgrounds. The cultures of these groups vary, and such the priorities and frame choices would likely reflect those variances, prioritizing some aspects of the story over others, and setting the agenda for what those groups expect and associate with cultural heritage and its destruction in armed conflict

Opting for a deep, rather than broad scope of news stories about specific impactful events during these conflicts should yield an in depth understanding of the way expectations and norms about this topic are formed and presented. It will also give me the opportunity to look at how the power inherent in frame creation is expressed (Vliegenthart and Zoonen, 2011), since the creation of frames by elites and the media serve to build and reinforce norms of previously agreed upon realities of societal roles and systems. (Poloni-Staudinger and Ortbals, 2014). This method of analysis operates under a social constructivist view of discourse, meaning that the way we talk about the issue is not external to the issue itself, but a part of its formation and continuation. Literature on framing focuses primarily on the construction and implications of cognitive and media frames. Vliegenthart and Zoonen(2011) critically discuss the development of frame analysis and lay out a sociological method which takes into account the levels of production and consumption of media. Their focus on the social construction of news, enforces a more sociological approach, rather than mass media studies, to frame research, allowing for a critical assessment and discussion.

Poloni-Staudinger and Ortbals, in their study "Gendering Abbottabad" (2014), use a media discourse analysis to examine the ways media frame women in the 2011 raid on Osama Bin Laden's compound in Pakistan. Their method emphasizes a broad examination of the content of dozens of news articles, determining the ways the gender of several of the actors, US Secretary of State Hilary Clinton and the wife of Osama Bin Laden, Amal Ahmed al-Sadah affected their roles in the raid, as presented in the narrative of events. Their analysis of the construction of frames of agency and gender roles

highlight the societal norms which impact how the actors and events are received and interpreted, norms which in some sense are taken for granted. This fits with my focus on the creation of news frames and definitions, and the sociological impacts they can have

Accordingly, the media is a socially constructed entity, reflecting and building upon society's understanding of complex concepts, making the study of cultural heritage, another key component of our social existence, in the context of news media a clear continuation of the process by which we have come to understand it.

My research questions therefore are as follows:

- RQ1: how are different frames employed in media coverage of ISIS' cultural heritage destruction?
- RQ2: What does the framing of this episode reveal about the way we a conceptualize destruction and define cultural heritage?
- RQ3: How do these definitions and conceptualizations, revealed by the frames employed tell us about how this type of destruction can be combatted or dealt with, given the legislative frameworks available?

To do this I have examined the 1954 Hague Convention and its two subsequent Protocols, as found in my preliminary research as the most comprehensive body of legislation which attempts to regulate and prevent continued cultural heritage destruction during armed conflict. In this way, I have used this text to examine the way the international community and state parties address the destruction of cultural heritage and

how the two Additional Protocols have caused the definition of cultural heritage to evolve. This legislation, built in the aftermath of different episodes of destruction and international concern for the future and protection of cultural heritage, links specifically with this conflict because of the conflict's transnational nature and the influence of this text over global response and procedures. While other measures have developed in response to this cultural heritage destruction, for the purposes of this research, the 1954 Convention has had the most influence, and is still employed as the dominant Convention dealing with cultural heritage destruction in armed conflict.

In the next step, I will analyze the frames and definitions that are employed in media discourse to explain the cultural heritage destruction we see in this recent episode. In light of the extensive and ongoing nature of ISIS destruction in the middle east, it is challenging to give this research a deeper focus while looking at the entirety of their destructive agenda. Therefore, in order to have a more precise moment to examine, I have identified the events surrounding ISIS' occupation of the city of Palmyra, in northern Syria as a significant episode in the discussion of cultural heritage destruction by this group. The functions of this episode, it's widely circulated images, its connection to a UNESCO World heritage site, its humanitarian dimension, and its completion (disregarding the current political component of the inclusion of Russia in the reconstruction of the city) make it an ideal moment to look at as part of the greater pattern in order to look at the way we frame this type of violence in the news. The explanation of frames, and the development of my frame analysis is presented prior to this section and for the purposes of this study, I will be employing Entman's media frame

definition with influence of Goffman's sociological explanation of the framing process and meaning-making.

Methods of analysis

This research will consist of a qualitative frame analysis using a deductive approach. I will use the frame analysis process, based on Entman's definition of media frames, found in Semetko and Valkenburg (2000), as well as Benford and Snow (2000) to incorporate several of the relevant frames that have been identified through their research. I will be using two categories of frames: Issue-specific frames based on analysis by Harmanşah, Herscher, and others which allow for a deeper examination of the frames and understandings used by scholars and politicians; and generalist frames, as identified in Semetko and Valkenburg (2000) to illuminate the way media prioritizes different responses, causes, and moral messages. The following list expands the frames I have identified: *Morality/Religion Frame; Human Interest/Human Tragedy Frame; World Impact Frame; Military/Tactical Frame; Economic Frame; Art/Museum Frame and Responsibility Frame,* on which I will base the analysis of news pieces. The analysis will explore how these frames are used in the discussion and should provide a look into the ways the different narratives are formed. For each framing category I will have four questions which drive the identification process, and in the code book, will organize each piece to allow for the presence of multiple frames to emerge. I will also record notes on other factors that may emerge in the reading of the pieces, such as additional frames or noteworthy items relevant to the analysis.

The analysis will rely on the following frames, which have been identified through the preliminary literature on Cultural Heritage Destruction and Framing research. This will allow me to describe how the frames are used in this particular case and explore the implications of these frames for considering the role of cultural heritage in conflicts.

Morality/religion frame*:*

This frame was brought into the discussion by numerous articles and the justification provided by ISIS in their statements and videos. The morality/religion frame positions CH as being intrinsically linked to its spiritual connection or worth. The ideas of good and evil, biblical dichotomies that are used often in our media representations of war, reflect this, and puts heritage and victims of violence on one end of the scale, and ISIS and their actions and ideology on the other. One of Entman's uses for frames is to provide a moral evaluation of a problem. As Harmanşah and Flood indicate, this moral message and the is done in this case primarily through the invocation of an iconoclastic agenda to explain ISIS motives, indicating that ISIS is taking its own stand and interpretations of morality in a manner which is inconsistent and diametrically opposed to our own. Semetko and Valkenburg indicate that moral frames are primarily expressed through the use of quotes, indirectly linking a subjective understanding of moral or immoral actions to an objective report. The inclusion of the iconoclasm in this makes it the least nuanced of the frames and much of the coverage of the event use the term itself to describe the action, recalling previous episodes of destruction in their analysis of the

situation. This frame helps to support a definition of cultural heritage as linked to religious and ideological power that ISIS is working to destroy

Human interest/human tragedy Frame:

This frame, from Semetko and Valkenburg(2001) operates to humanize the situation or subjects by either linking the destruction to the human groups which are affected to the violence, or attempting to impose human-like qualities on the violated objects in question. In this way, the article would put an emphasis on the emotional aspects of the conflict, perhaps invoking emotive anecdotes or stories by vulnerable individuals and employing metaphors or adjectives which are meant to induce certain responses in the reader. this technique easily grabs and retains the attention of a reader and personalizes the problem. In the connection to human rights and the international legislation that attempts to address this issue, this frame has played a prominent role, as the texts and legislation underline the importance of cultural property for cultural continuity, and in writing, the objects are necessarily second to the lives of people.

World Impact Frame:

The World Impact Frame is an issue specific frame drawn from the recent developments in this our understanding of CH and international legislation dealing with it, most notably the contrast between the ideas of the cultural heritage of *peoples* and of *all people,* a critical distinction which has yet to be fully agreed upon or set in the legislation. in contrast to the human interest frame, the internationalist, world impact, frame characterizes the cultural value of heritage as being above the communities and

regions where they are located, or possessing more than material value. The presence of, and Convention s surrounding the idea of World Heritage already does this, and Detling and O'Keefe develop this idea further. By employing this perspective and definition, the frame would elicit more international attention, possibly invoking Convention al law and proposing a more international responsibility of addressing it. However, this also has the capacity to overshadow the communities and the immediate and long-term human toll of the action, giving priority to the impact destruction has on those who are geographically apart from both the violence and the cultural heritage.

Military/Tactical Frame:

This is issue specific frame which would seek to make sense of the destruction in tactical, practical, or strategic sense, looking at the destruction in terms of goals and traditional military terminology or ideas, in gaining territory and resources. This puts the problem of CHD directly in the realm of military response and definitions. It also separates the aims and implications of the act from ideological or religious influence, no longer employing a moral message. The framing would employ calculations and objective facts to illustrate the extent of the destruction. Maps and graphs also help to do this, laying out the logical progression of this act in order to counter it. This frame allows for the weaponization of non-weapons, such as cultural heritage and in a sense can make non-combatants into actors in the conflict.

Economic Frame*:*

The general Economic Frame presents the issue in a way which indicates the economic impact of the destruction. Metaphors like “priceless” in reference to antiquities, and outside the context of sales, already regularly attach monetary connections to items which are not for sale. This frame is used often and marks the consequence of an action as having an impact on the economic situation of a group of country. (de vreese, s+v, 1999). This frame would also be prominent in a discussion of interventions and the economic benefits/challenges of intervening for different reasons. Specifically, in this case, another economic aspect which would be employed would be the ability of CH to be used as an economic tool, invoking discussions on illicit trade, markets and the influence of buyers around the world.

Responsibility Frame:

The general responsibility frame defines causes and assigns responsibility for an issue. While frames inherently work to give causal interpretations to events (Entman, 1993), this frame assigns responsibility of both the cause and the future solutions, deciding in a sense who started the problem, where it came from historically and who should be responsible for ending and correcting the issue. The impact and connection to legislation require a discussion on Responsibility to Protect by the international as well as local authorities. Responsibility and the invocation of power directly affect one another, and that relationship will be looked at in the analysis.

Art and History Frame*:*

This issue-specific frame categorizes cultural heritage in terms of its artistic value, emphasizing the visual beauty of the property, and its loss with its destruction. This frame will be based on the language employed in the pieces which focus on the aesthetic value of the property. While it is certainly not an uncommon way to look at cultural heritage, this frame is important to examine as it has the potential to emphasize this aspect over the humanitarian impact of the destruction.

Sample Selection

The selection of news pieces is performed through the news aggregation platform LexisNexis, and the sources chosen had the largest number of articles on this particular subject during the specified time-period, in the months following ISIS' invasion of Palmyra in May 2015. It is expected that certain events in this wider episode of destruction will have received more consideration in news media, and that selection will impact those aspects of their framing choices, as different events spark and react to different responses. I have used the search query "Destruction AND Palmyra AND ISIS OR ISIL OR Islamic State" with a date range of 1 May, 2014 to 31 December, 2015. In order to get a variety of events and views in my analysis, I have chosen articles from the following sources which have covered these conflicts (alphabetically) Their use in this study is justified by their individual reach (readers) and the diversity in background, history, and geographic location. All are available online and in English, a key limitation in my own abilities as a researcher:

- **Daily Star (Lebanon)**: The independent Beirut-based English language newspaper was founded in 1952 and covers issues from Lebanon and the wider Middle East for the English speaking community. While financial issues caused the newspaper to shut down temporarily in 2009, it has since rekindled its readership to about 80,000 website visitors each day (Paul Doyle (1 March 2012). *Lebanon*. Bradt Travel Guides. p. 78.)

- **New York Times**: NYT is a major American daily newspaper founded in 1851, with one of the largest print circulations in the world. It covers world news, culture, business news, and a variety of human interest topics. The paper's motto is "All the News That's Fit to Print" indicating its wide breadth of coverage and topics.

- **The Times (London):** The Times is a British Daily newspaper which began in 1785 and is owned by NewsCorp. It has a daily printed circulation of nearly 400,000 readers in the London area (Wikipedia)

- **The Guardian:** The Guardian was founded in 1821 and covers news areas from investigative journalism and high readership have made it the fifth most widely read newspapers in the world with over 42.6 million readers. It was named Newspaper of the year by the British Press Awards as well as several others (Wikipedia)

- **Malta Today:** MT is a twice-weekly newspaper printed in English in San Gwann, Malta since 1999. It uses investigative and analytical journalism to cover local and international developments in the news as well as social commentary, culture and sport.

- **Daily News Egypt**: DNE is an Egyptian Daily newspaper, printed in English and established in 2005 covering "business, political and cultural news and analysis". It purports to be the only Independent English Newspaper in the Country, and therefore not subject to government censor. However, this newspaper also has the smallest readership of the sources listed above, with a circulation of between 10-40,000.

The analysis of news frames, as defined sociologically by Goffman, and later in the field of mass communication by Robert Entman, that are employed in the discussion of Cultural heritage destruction by ISIS in Palmyra will, in summary, be conducted through a qualitative analysis based on the procedure outlined in Semetko and Valkenburg (2000), which looks at the prevalence and use of frames identified in previous research. This will, however explore deeper the use of the frames in making meaning of the act of cultural heritage destruction, by looking at a small sample of news articles (39) which surround a specific group's actions in a specific locale, and the international coverage of those actions.

The list of articles and the questions used to determine frames can be found in Appendices 1-3.

CHAPTER SIX: ANALYSIS OF RESULTS AND IMPLICATIONS

This chapter will highlight the main findings of the analysis and seek to answer the Research questions, setting a basis for further discussion on the implication of these frames in the larger conflict and its impact on CR. The results of each of the frames follow the order used in the previous section and the criteria and questions used to determine the framing process will be listed in the Appendices. It must be stressed that the size of the sample of articles is too small to be completely representative of the entirety of news coverage on this topic or episode of destruction, however the information gleaned from the frame analysis reveal interesting and important insights into the creation of meaning of cultural heritage in the context of its destruction, and present a glimpse of the overall conceptualization of the topic. The results of this research show that the definition and explanations for cultural heritage in the context of this current episode in Syria vary but ultimately

Overview -

The analysis looked at the incidences of the framing categories listed in the previous chapter and looked at examples of how they were used and how they interacted with other frames, as well as other noteworthy aspects about the way they were presented in the articles analyzed.

A notable point discovered in the articles I analyzed was the common use of timelines of destruction. These included both timelines of destruction by ISIS during the course of this conflict, as well as timelines of previous episodes in other regions in the world, linking this one temporally to other events of similar nature. In defining and conceptualizing the heritage in this case, the articles assume a connection to the destructive episodes in both justification (in this case, religious Ideology) and impact on the human population (loss of information, loss of meaning). This was especially true in the connection to world heritage and the World Impact Frame.

Frame Prevalence

The convergence of human loss with the pillage and destruction of cultural property in Palmyra was prevalent in the pieces which made use of the Human Interest/Human Tragedy frame, highlighting the inseparability of these two types of violence in this conflict. The frame itself necessitates a personification of the cultural property itself, and the news pieces which exemplified this frame tended to apply human characteristics and used words like "mourn". The understanding of CHD under this framework very firmly grounds it in the communities surrounding the site, who are subject to immediate violence.

Only one of the articles was found to make use of the Economic Frame, despite many of the articles referring only briefly to the use of looted cultural property as a means to finance violent operations. In this way the financial aspects of the preservation and destruction and looting then becomes secondary to the emotive, human aspects of

them. By not utilizing an economic frame, the articles seek to de-legitimize the actions of the group, as economic processes seem to be seen to be more rational, understandable, a presentation the group itself prefers to project and believe of themselves, even though violent acts. Instead, this frame is not presented, and delegitimizing terms like "barbarian" and "monstrous" are employed, alongside descriptions of their grisly acts. The economic frame, had it been used, would have been an interesting conceptualization of cultural heritage, in defining the value, not in terms of the monetary damage, but in a more human based loss. For example, in cases of natural disaster, we often see damage being calculated in terms of the amount of money it would take to rebuild or replace the items or buildings destroyed, what could be considered an essential step in the solution. Instead, the articles do not seek to estimate the costs of rebuilding or replacing the cultural property in any financial terms, though the term “treasure” was frequently used, a fact which puts the cultural property in a sort of mythological realm of value estimation.

The Religious/Iconoclasm Frame was less prevalent in the pieces analyzed despite large amounts of scholarly analysis of the group's violence and statements the group has made regarding similar acts in other locales. For example, during the infamous video of ISIS militants destroying artifacts in the Mosul Museum in Iraq, one of the speakers says the following:

> *“These ruins that are behind me, they are idols and statues that people in the past used to worship instead of Allah. The so-called Assyrians and Akkadians and others looked to gods for war, agriculture and rain to whom they offered*

sacrifices…The Prophet Mohammed took down idols with his bare hands when he went into Mecca. We were ordered by our prophet to take down idols and destroy them, and the companions of the prophet did this after this time, when they conquered countries." (IBT, 2015).

In all of the pieces, there was frequent mention of ISIS' brand of Sunni Islam, but rarely more than one or two sentences. However, 16 of the 39 pieces analyzed mention that religious ideology as a cause for the destruction, while the same number of articles mentioned non-religious reasons or justifications for it. More significantly though the pieces which exhibited similar characteristics of the Religion Frame frequently made use of discussion focused not on religion, but incompatible world views. Though not supernaturally prescribed, this explanation characterized the property at Palmyra as the embodiment of multi-cultural, global ideals that are in direct opposition to the ideology of the group.

That the Cultural Property itself possessed that ideological agency to essentially become a party to the conflict and an enemy (and target) of ISIS, speaks very strongly of the power associated with the objects and architecture. Defining it in this way works toward associating it in a realm separate from the way the Hague Convention and its Additional protocols deal with it. The provisions of the secular document do not attempt to create any ideological or societal changes to address this challenge. Therefore, framing it in this light and understanding violence against cultural property as being intrinsically

linked to religious dogma makes it a challenge to combat and has the potential to keep the destruction and the conflict intractable.

> *The extremists believe ancient relics promote idolatry. ISIS militants claim they are destroying ancient artifacts and archaeological treasures as part of their purge of paganism - though they are also believed to sell off looted antiquities as a significant income earner.(Article 22)*

Incidentally, only one article made use of both the Religion/Iconoclasm Frame as well as the Human Interest/Human Tragedy Frame, whereas the aspects of other framing categories overlapped on many occasions in the same article. This is significant in the way we judge the impact of this violence and how we anticipate the victims and ideology associated with this conflict. The religious aspects of the violence, in the presentation of iconoclastic sentiments by the group itself, were taken at face value in most of the news coverage within that frame category. Like the presentation of ISIS-provided ideo and photographic evidence of the destruction in this and other events, it is presented as fact, and not challenged in the news pieces.

The Human Interest/Human Tragedy Frame made a considerable use of anecdotes and quotes by local people in the vicinity of Palmyra, expressing their connection to the site as well as their loss and grief in its damage. In the coverage of the continued occupation and the episodes of destruction, a largest amount of violence is of course sustained by the human beings in the region. Their own stories, especially in this case, of the late Syrian archaeologist Khaled al-Asaad, tie the experience of people to the

destruction of the property. Similar to the Religious/Iconoclasm Frame, the people themselves, by virtue of their relationship to the cultural heritage, are the embodiment of an opposite to ISIS, and their experiences are told sympathetically through narratives and anecdotes while also noting the violence which they have been subjected to:

> *"The, one of the Middle East's most spectacular archaeological sites. He even named his daughter after Zenobia, the queen that ruled from the city some 1,700 years ago. ISIS militants who now control the city beheaded him in a main square and hung his body on a pole"*.(Article 22)

The frame was only prevalent in the longest articles of the set, a length which gave the authors a greater chance to explore the human dimension of the destruction in Palmyra, with the shortest articles exhibiting almost no aspects of this frame. This should be significant in showing that in this case the human impact of the destruction come out second to the other effects when there was only a limited space to present the story.

The World Impact Frame provided an interesting look at how the different newspapers prioritized the internationalist approach to Cultural Heritage. Fifteen of the pieces referred directly to the site as a UNESCO World Heritage site, however few pieces discussed international approaches for dealing with the destruction, including the mention of The Hague Convention or other legislation and international groups. This was only seen in pieces from the Lebanese Newspaper, The Daily Star, and the London Times. While the sample size of my data is not large enough to draw from it reliable patterns, it is worth noting the significance of this, as Lebanon being in the region, would possibly

be more likely to employ this World Impact frame to call on support from outside sources. The example in the Times of London dealt primarily however, with the commitment of Britain to The Hague convention. The world impact frame has the potential to elevate the status of the site in the collective understanding. Conversely, if the heritage site is already understood as having a world value, through its official designation and cultural recognizability and history, then employing the frame may have less of an effect on the interpretation.

> *Syria's antiquities, including cities that for thousands of years have been among the world's most important crossroads, are "not for the government or the opposition, they are for all Syrians," he said. "It's for you also -- for American people, for European people, for Japanese people. It's all your heritage." (art 19)*

The Military/Tactical Frame looks at the destruction from a tactical and therefore non-ideological point of view, using language relating to military action or relating directly and predominately to the military responses and strategies in this episode. The frame presented the destruction in a way which was separate from the religious beliefs of ISIS. This also easily tied into the human tragedy frame, as several of the pieces explored them simultaneously. The space was available to explore more strongly the human devastation which seemed more sympathetic to the human suffering and loss that was occurring alongside the destruction of cultural heritage. While not generally emotionally driven, this frame explored the loss in a more straightforward way, listing destruction

occurring in the same manner by other actors, something which was left unacknowledged in the majority of articles. For example:

> *"Residents of Palmyra have also suffered under intensified bombardment by government warplanes over the past month, some of which did their own damage to the archaeological site, Mr. Homsi and others said…there were 222 air raids, using rockets as well as naval mines, gas cylinders and barrel bombs, that killed 97 people and destroyed 239 houses and three ancient structures. The government says it is aiming at terrorists". (Article 2)*

This frame also attempted to look at alternate reasons for destructive acts, not associated with religious or ideological reasons that were seen in other frames. Many went so far as to question that interpretation outright and to challenge the accuracy of the evidence provided by ISIS themselves, still images or videos of explosions. Other articles without this frame made use of those images and interpreted them as factual, a move which could be seen to legitimize the act itself through the impact the image has. The reasons included the use of the destructive images as propaganda, curated for this purpose. While none of the articles using this frame specifically examine this process, or question the role of media to address it, several mention the conflicting reports of parties in the region over what has been destroyed.

By framing the episode in this way, the destruction of cultural property in Palmyra is seen as a way for the group to strategically attack both the local populations and the broader international community, as the images are then shared by media outlets.

The Responsibly Frame, identified strongly in five of the articles of the thirty-nine in total, dealt mostly with the solutions to this type of violence in various ways. The most startling finding of this frame category was that only one article implicated other actors in any of the destruction of cultural property in Palmyra, specifically destruction by Syrian troops and damage done by airstrikes. This is meaningful, because while many of the pieces certainly took the time to explore human perspectives and stories.

Solutions to the violence were split into two realms, once again the nationalist and internationalist approaches. The nationalist frame presented the solution as something that must be taken care of internally, and that the site is important most for those who will be ultimately tasked with protecting or rebuilding it. As well as the destruction by ISIS, this framing acknowledged more of the challenges to correcting this issue. This included the destruction by airstrikes against ISIS in the city.

> *'With the opposition, we will have some kind of compromise," he said, in striking remarks for an official in Damascus, where the government sometimes refers to all opponents as terrorists. "At the end of the day, it is politics," Mr. Abdulkarim added. "But with ISIS, it is different. ISIS will attack all things." Mr. Abdulkarim said he was proud of the 2,500 employees in his department, working "in areas under control of the government and also under control of the opposition," saying they had saved some 300,000 objects but were unable to protect all of Syria's 10,000 archaeological sites. Mr. Azm has worked with a group of Syrians he calls the Monuments Men, documenting destruction and looting and taking measures to protect antiquities, including encasing precious mosaics in protective coating and*

sandbags in a museum in the northern town of Maarat al-Noaman. The museum was later hit in a government bombing. (Article 19)

The localized approach to the destruction, the 'monuments men' which is discussed above deals with the issue in a way consistent with the provisions in The Hague Convention, in taking steps to prevent and save cultural property. The coverage of this approach acknowledges the immense challenge of the mission, but presents a generally optimistic view, celebrating the successes of their actions.

The internationalist approach to a solution came primarily through statements by other nations or international bodies like UNESCO, stating their commitment to the national initiatives, rather than presenting new ideas for international projects. These pieces were therefore less optimistic or proactive in their tone.

*"Britain has committed to protecting ancient artefacts at risk of being looted and destroyed by **Isis** in Syria and Iraq.*

The government announced yesterday that it would bankroll a team of "rescue archaeologists" to save historic sites in the form of a "monuments men-style" cultural protection fund".(Article 25)

The intersection of this perspective with the World Impact Frame discussed earlier show that there is an inconsistency with who should be responsible for dealing with the destruction at each level. While the !954 Hague Convention clearly states that it is the responsibility of high contracting Parties to prevent destruction and looting within their own territory,

The Art/Museum Frame was used strongly in five of the articles, with eight of the thirty-nine discussing the property primarily in terms of its aesthetic or artistic value, as well as giving a narrative of the site's historical background and importance. This frame, while not extensively used, was important characterizing the sites themselves as the literal victims, through emphasizing the superficial aspects of the site.

> *"This brutal conjunction of beauty and violence - the remaining columns of the ancient city gold-hued against the leaden plume of destruction floating in the pure blue sky - is an image of sheer fanaticism, unbridled hatred, and the obliteration of everything anyone has ever called civilised…. Surely, the prisoners tied to pillars intentionally recall the three crosses in the Christian Passion, as portrayed by artists such as Rembrandt. Yet the echoes of Christian martyrdom go deeper. Christ was tied to a column to be tortured before his death. Piero della Francesca and Caravaggio, among others, have depicted this moment of suffering and humiliation".(Article 1)*

. *"She wrote that "the stone used here is a beautiful white limestone that looks like marble and weathers a golden yellow like the Acropolis". As she rode on a camel into town, she passed the "famous Palmyrene tombs", "great stone towers, 4 stories [sic] high, some more ruined and some less, standing together in groups or bordering the road ... Except Petra, Palmyra is the loveliest thing I have seen in this country." (article 10)*

By connecting the cultural property to value placed on it by its aesthetic value, the articles frame the destruction in a way which is comfortable for the reader to initially consume, as it is the most recognizable aspect of the site itself, its physical attributes. Because of its straightforward nature and its inclusion alongside other categories, such as the world impact or religious frames, it is challenging to thoroughly dissect how it is used without a separate study.

The frame categories discussed above help to illuminate how the concept of cultural heritage is understood in the context of its destruction, and show how the different conceptualizations of this can have an effect on how it is prioritized in the public sphere. How it is understood directly impacts what mechanisms can be used to correct the destruction, however few of the articles discussed this aspect of the conflict and none offered concrete solutions (Valkenburg et al, 1999; Rueben, 2009). While several made use of a timeline to express the fact that this episode is one of many, both in this conflict and in the greater history of cultural heritage destruction, none presented the outcomes of those previous episodes and how approaches have changed in response to those conflicts and events, such as the Second World War and the wars in Yugoslavia and Kuwait.

The third research question, (How do these definitions and conceptualizations, revealed by the frames employed tell us about how this type of destruction can be combatted or dealt with, given the legislative frameworks available?) was challenge to discern from the frame analysis. Several of the frames used in the articles, primarily the

Responsibility Frame and the World Impact Frame refer directly or indirectly to the methods of the 1954 Hague Convention and how to go about combatting it. However, they did not give any great prescriptions for dealing with the violence, and relied primarily on the established definition of cultural heritage as it relates to the international community.

The provisions of the Convention dealing with this type of violence in regards to a non-state group like ISIS seemed difficult to address within the framing we saw in the articles analyzed, but this reveals a challenge which is characteristic of contemporary war as Mary Kaldor and der Auwera discuss in my second chapter. Namely, it demonstrates that within the parameters of the convention's language and prescriptions, there is a lack of clarity when discussing these acts, particularly surrounding the responsibility of outside actors to protect the sites themselves, when they are characterized as important to all groups within the international community. The articles of the convention should then be strengthened through implementation and execution in armed conflict, holding groups who act against what is customary law.

CHAPTER SEVEN: IMPLICATIONS AND CONCLUSION

What does the framing of this episode reveal about the way we a conceptualize destruction and define cultural heritage? The Frame analysis showed some of the varying interpretations of Cultural Heritage, as well at the relevance and relationship to local and international communities, as well as underscores the difficulties in addressing this type of violence. While not a truly representative sample, the analysis showed that the way the events were presented in the news pieces were impacted by the framing categories the made use of to tell their story. The study was limited by several factors but overall was able to express a significant analysis of the frames used to cover the events in Palmyra.

Limitations of the Study

This thesis encountered several challenges in its execution and of course is limited in its ability to do justice the entire scope of this topic and global challenge. One key note on this research is that the number of articles analyzed is too small to be a representative sample of the events as a whole. This inability to look at a broader range of news pieces, specifically those which are written in a language other than English certainly means that voices and pieces of data were certainly excluded from my analysis. An analysis of a broader set of news pieces in other languages or from different regions could be illuminating to show the varied definitions used to frame cultural heritage and its destruction.

Another limitation of the study is that it doesn't look at other events within the broader episode of conflict in Syria and the rest of the region, which could reveal how the framing and definitions have changed over time, or with different actors, nor does it look at the mechanisms of frame creation in the news pieces. This also was unable to explore the destructive acts by other actors in the same conflict, for example by coalition airstrikes in equally important sites in the same region, other armed groups, or by civilian looting. Nor did the research look at the framing of cultural heritage destruction in other settings and incidences of armed conflict. The thesis also did not have the chance to more thoroughly analyze statements made by officials, such as UNESCO chief Irina Bokova, regarding the violence, and instead relied on the secondary coverage of those statements. This type of data would be useful in more fully analyzing the views and abilities of major actors dealing with this challenge.

Continued research along these lines could further illuminate how we conceptualize, understand and prioritize the role of cultural property and cultural heritage in armed conflict. Several research questions emerged at the completion of this study which could further increase the scope of this project, including - how has the definition of cultural property and its worthiness of protection changed within this conflict; what are the criteria for a site to receive media attention in its destruction; has compliance with international conventional law impacted the likelihood of this type of violence to occur? These questions would be useful in increasing our understanding of this type of violence as well as providing useful data on the efficacy of current approaches.

Conclusion

The way cultural heritage is conceptualized in its destruction should also give us pause to consider how it is conceptualized in its protection and preservation. Through understanding how sites and ideals about them are prioritized or considered worthy of conservation and preservation, we can see an impact on the narratives and the historical and political backdrop for a society. As this and so many previous episodes have demonstrated, cultural heritage and cultural property are not benign creations, and are endowed with immense political and ideological power when employed in certain ways. While a tremendous source of knowledge and cultural memory, sites like Palmyra and the pieces housed in museums like the one in Mosul have the potential to be mobilized as weapons against those for whom they are such treasures, especially during increasingly hostile, ethnic and identity based conflicts.

While humanitarian concern and horror over the expansion of the Islamic State is certainly justified, and should be at the forefront of concern in this conflict, the methods that the group uses to expand their terror and their ideology and wreak havoc on communities and the world at large, should not be overlooked. Sites and history are mobilized by ISIS in this conflict as weapons against their enemies, and they are able to use them well, whether economically, in the plunder and sale of ancient art, or ideologically and psychologically, through the cinematic depictions of destruction shared and re-shared online and in the news. However, this thesis does not argue for a prioritization of stone temples and sculptures over the lives of men women and children, who suffer at their mercy every day in Iraq, Syria, and now so many other nations (a

number which continues to grow), but calls for some considerations for the things which make us human.

To look back, after the downfall of ISIS, we must have more than simply rubble and fallen shells of buildings in these countries if there is any hope of rebuilding the heritage of societies that once, and will again one day, make up the region. The question of preserving the future of our global heritage cannot exclude UNESCO and international legislation, but must also incorporate those who are most urgently affected by these threats. Local people and local scholars bring the humanity back to the study of what these sites can mean for generations to come. The history that is preserved and has dazzled generations over countless centuries represents an ideal, whether factual or otherwise, that we must strive to reach, and represents a place in history from where we, society and civilization as a whole, have come.

APENDIX 1: ARTICLES ANALYZED

	Date	Source	Title	Word Count
1	28-Oct-15	Guardian	Islamic State's latest attack on Palmyra is a picture of the end of civilisation	566
2	6-Oct-15	NYT	Islamic State Destroys Ancient Arches in Syria	627
3	5-Oct-15	NYT	ISIS Destroys Another Monument at Palmyra Ruins in Syria	352
4	4-Oct-15	Guardian	They are barbarians': meet the man defending Syria's heritage from Isis	1046
5	Sep 4, 2015	Guardian	From Parthenon to Palmyra: a history of cultural destruction	776
6	Sep 3, 2015	Daily Star	Defending past and future affirms human survival	788
7	Sep 2, 2015	Guardian	Isis's destruction of Palmyra: 'The heart has been ripped out of the city'	2914
8	Sep 2, 2015	Guardian	The fate of the temple of Bel is a symbol of the tragedy engulfing Syria	867
9	Sep 1, 2015	Guardian	Isis is systematically destroying Palmyra, top antiquities official says	768
10	Sep 1, 2015	Guardian	Temple of Bel still standing, says Syria's antiquities chief	477
11	Sep 1, 2015	NYT	U.N. Confirms Destruction of an Ancient Temple by ISIS	617
12	Sep 1, 2015	Times	Palmyra's end in sight as Isis blasts biggest temple	697
13	31-Aug-15	NYT	Militants Damage a Temple in Palmyra	390
14	26-Aug-15	NYT	The Crimes of Palmyra	487
15	25-Aug-15	Guardian	Palmyra: destruction of ancient temple is a war crime, says Unesco chief;	916
16	25-Aug-15	NYT	ISIS Accelerates Destruction of Antiquities in Syria	1285
17	25-Aug-15	Times	Isis begins the destruction of Palmyra treasures	1082
18	24-Aug-15	Times	Isis destroys ancient Palmyra temple	429
19	20-Aug-15	Daily Star	ISIS beheads leading Syrian relics scholar in Palmyra	727
20	July 10, 2015	Daily Star	Syria army advances on ISIS in Palmyra	697
21	July 4, 2015	NYT	Islamic State Destroys More Artifacts in Iraq and Syria	596
22	July 3, 2015	Times	Isis militants smash statues smuggled away from Palmyra	342

23	June 25, 2015	NYT	Islamic State Militants Appear to Destroy Two Historic Tombs in Syria	330
24	June 22, 2015	Daily Star	Fears rise after ISIS plants mines at Palmyra's ancient ruins	856
25	June 22, 2015	Times	Britain backs archaeologists to rescue artefacts from Isis	323
26	June 12, 2015	Daily Star	Lebanon safeguards region's cultural heritage	912
27	16-Sep-15	MaltaToday	ISIL lays waste to mankind's heritage	1047
28	5-Oct-15	MaltaToday	Islamic State blows up Arch of Triumph in Palmyra	378
29	May 15, 2015	MaltaToday	Ancient Syrian city of Palmyra under threat as IS fighters advance	312
30	May 21, 2015	MaltaToday	Ancient Syrian city of Palmyra falls to IS	279
31	31-Aug-15	DN-Egypt	Another temple in Syria's Palmyra severely damaged	347
32	31-Aug-15	MaltaToday	Islamic State attacks another ancient temple in Palmyra	274
33	24-Aug-15	MaltaToday	IS destroy ancient temples in Palmyra	436
34	4-Sep-15	DN-Egypt	'Islamic State' blows up tower tombs at Syria's Palmyra	242
35	24-Aug-15	DN-Egypt	'Islamic State' blows up Baal Shamin temple in Syria's Palmyra	340
36	24-Aug-15	DN-Egypt	'Islamic State's' destruction of Palmyra temple 'war crime': UNESCO	334
37	5-Sep-15	DN-Egypt	Cultural treasures are also victims of war	805
38	27-Oct-15	MaltaToday	IS militants blow up three captives in Palmyra	281
39	20-Aug-15	DN-Egypt	How the IS is waging war on Syrian culture	677

APPENDIX 2: FRAME CODING QUESTIONS

The following yes/no questions were used to determine frame usage in the individual articles analyzed. If an article answered yes to more the majority of questions in a frame category (2/3 or 3/4), then it was noted and highlighted in the table

Religion Iconoclasm Frame

1. Does the article mention religious ideology as a cause for the destruction?
2. Does the article discuss the destruction in the terms of idols, or iconoclasm?
3. Does the article make reference to the moral aspects of the destruction?

Human Interest/Human Tragedy Frame

4. Does the article provide a “human face” to the cultural heritage?
5. Does the article give anecdotal or personal stories or quotes from local people?
6. Does the article use adjectives or metaphors meant to induce a sense of grief or loss?
7. Does the article discuss impact on local communities?

World Impact Frame

8. Does the article discuss the international importance of the CP?
9. Does the article employ the term World heritage?
10. Does the article discuss the impact on global "values" such as multiculturalism or secularism?
11. Does the article discuss international bodies or legislation to address the issue?

Military/Tactical Frame

12. Does the article discuss non-ideological reasons for the destruction?
13. Does the article provide a suggestion for a military-based solution?
14. Does the article discuss the purpose of the destruction in military terms?

Economic Interest Frame

15. Does the article use terms or metaphors which give value statements about heritage?
16. Are values of CH described in financial terms?
17. Does the article discuss economic consequences of this issue?
18. Does the article discuss the financing through looting of cultural heritage?

Responsibility Frame

19. Does the article cite any other individuals or groups who are the cause for this issue?
20. Does the article make reference to international approaches to dealing with issue?
21. Does the article give a prescription for who should/can prevent CHD?
22. Does the article list any local initiatives or solutions?

Art/Museum Frame

23. Does the story emphasize the artistic aspects of the site or the destruction?
24. Does the article utilize input or quotes by art historians?
25. Does the article use language which focuses on aethsetic beauty of the site?
26. Does the article look at CH in terms of its historical value in the world?

APPENDIX 3: FRAME PREVELENCE

Frames and Questions																																			
#		Iconoclasm Religion Frame				Human interest/Human tragedy				World Impact Frame				Military / Tactical frame				Economic Interest Frame				Responsibility Frame				Art/museum Frame									
		1	2	3		4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14		15	16	17	18		19	20	21	22		23	24	25	26						
1			1	1			1	1																			1	1	1							
2														1	1	1																				
3														1		1									1		1		1							
4																									1	1		1								
5		1	1																								1			1						
6				1		1	1																	1	1											
7		1	1																								1	1	1	1						
8		1	1	1			1	1				1																								
9						1								1																						
10		1												1		1																				
11						1	1			1	1														1											
12		1	1							1	1	1																								
13							1	1						1		1							1		1											
14		1	1								1	1												1												
15		1							1					1		1									1	1	1									
16						1	1	1	1					1		1									1	1			1							
17							1	1	1	1	1	1	1					1		1	1															
18		1	1																																
19		1				1	1	1	1					1															1							
20							1		1		1			1	1	1								1	1	1										
21											1										1															
22													1	1																						
23		1																			1															
24							1			1	1	1	1	1									1	1												
25													1	1										1	1	1										
26										1	1		1							1	1			1	1	1										
27									1	1	1																									
28				1																							1									
29										1	1		1											1	1		1	1	1							
30		1	1							1	1	1															1		1							
31		1	1							1	1		1																							
32		1									1		1	1		1																				
33									1	1	1										1															
34		1	1																																	
35														1		1								1	1											
36														1																						
37		1								1	1	1	1	1									1	1	1											
38		1				1							1																							
39				1		1	1	1	1			1				1					1															
		16	10	5	0	7	11	7	8	0	11	15	8	10	0	16	2	10	0	1	0	2	6	0	3	9	13	6	0	8	4	7	2	0		

REFERENCES

"The Hague Convention | United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization." N.p., n.d. Web. 23 Oct. 2015.

Auwera, Sigrid van der. "Contemporary Conflict, Nationalism, and the Destruction of Cultural Property During Armed Conflict: A Theoretical Framework." Journal of Conflict Archaeology 7.1 (2012): 49–65. Taylor and Francis+NEJM. Web.

Auwera, Sigrid Van der. "International Law and the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict: Actual Problems and Challenges." *The Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society* 43.4 (2013): 175–190. Web.

Auwera, Sigrid Van der. "UNESCO and the Protection of Cultural Property during Armed Conflict." *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 19.1 (2013): 1–19. Web.

Bahrani, Zainab. "The Absent Past: Heritage Destruction and Historical Erasure Today. Keynote Lecture Istanbul Conference: The Future of the Past." 16 Oct. 2015: n. pag. Print.

Balcells, Marc. "Left Behind? Cultural Destruction, the Role of the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia in Deterring It and Cultural Heritage Prevention Policies in the Aftermath of the Balkan Wars." European Journal on Criminal Policy and Research 21.1 (2015): 1–13. Web.

Benford, Robert D., and David A. Snow. "Framing Processes and Social Movements: An Overview and Assessment." Annual Review of Sociology 26 (2000): 611–639. Print.

Benjamin, Walter. "Producing the Present." Economic & Political Weekly 48.43 (2013): 91. Print.

Bennett, W. Lance. "Constructing Publics and Their Opinions." Political Communication 10.2 (1993): 101–120. Web.

Bhat, P. Ishwara. "Protection Of Cultural Property Under International Humanitarian Law: Some Emerging Trends." ISIL Year Book of International Humanitarian and Refugee Law n. pag. Web. 18 Sept. 2016.

Boylan, Patrick J. “The Concept of Cultural Protection in Times of Armed Conflict: From the Crusades to the New Millennium.” Illicit Antiquities. Ed. N. Brodie and K. B. Tubb. London: Routledge, 2001. Print.

Breidenbach, Joana, and Pál Nyíri. “‘Our Common Heritage’: New Tourist Nations, Post-‘Socialist’ Pedegogy, and the Globalization of Nature.” *Current Anthropology* 48.2 (2007): 322–330. *JSTOR*. Web.

Brodie, Neil. “Why Is No One Talking About Libya’s Cultural Destruction?” *Near Eastern Archaeology* 78.3 (2015): 212–217. Print.

Butler, Judith. *Frames of War: When Is Life Grievable?* London ; New York: Verso, 2009. Print.

Cambanis, Thanassis, and 2015. “Why ISIS’ Destruction of Antiquities Hurts so Much.” *The Boston Globe* 10 Mar. 2015. Web. 9 Mar. 2016.

Centre, UNESCO World Heritage. “UNESCO World Heritage Centre - 39th Session of the Committee.” N.p., n.d. Web. 7 Mar. 2016.

D’Angelo, Paul. “News Framing as a Multiparadigmatic Research Program: A Response to Entman.” *Journal of Communication* 52.4 (2002): 870–888. Web.

Daniels, Brian, and The 80th Annual Meeting of the Society for American Archaeology. “Community Archaeology and Emergency Responses to Heritage in Crisis.” 2015: n. pag. Print.

Detling, Karen J. “Eternal Silence: The Destruction of Cultural Property in Yugoslavia.” *Md. J. Int’l L. & Trade* 17 (1993): 41. Print.

Drazewska, Berenika. “The Human Dimension of the Protection of the Cultural Heritage from Destruction during Armed Conflicts.” *International Journal of Cultural Property* 22.2–3 (2015): 205–228. Web.

Ekern, Stener et al. “Human Rights and World Heritage: Preserving Our Common Dignity through Rights-Based Approaches to Site Management.” *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 18.3 (2012): 213–225. Web.

Entman, Robert M. “Framing Bias: Media in the Distribution of Power.” *Journal of Communication* 57.1 (2007): 163–173. Web.

Entman, Robert M. “Framing: Toward Clarification of a Fractured Paradigm.” *Journal of communication* 43.4 (1993): 51–58. Print.

Flood, Finbarr Barry. “Between Cult and Culture: Bamiyan, Islamic Iconoclasm, and the Museum. (Cover Story).” *Art Bulletin* 84.4 (2002): 641. Print.

Foyle, Jonathan. “Is It Time to Rethink Our Ideas about Preserving World Heritage?” *Financial Times (FT.Com)* 22 May 2015. Web. 5 Mar. 2016.

Gartenstein-Ross, Daveed, Nathaniel Barr, and Bridget Moreng. “The Islamic State’s Global Propaganda Strategy.” Terrorism and Counter-Terrorism Studies (2016): n. pag. CrossRef. Web.

Ghorashi, Hannah. “A Look at the Full Scope of ISIS’s Destruction of Cultural Heritage Sites.” ARTnews. N.p., 7 Nov. 2015. Web. 26 Feb. 2016.

Hamilakis, Yannis. “The ‘War on Terror’ and the Military–Archaeology Complex: Iraq, Ethics, and Neo-Colonialism.” *Archaeologies* 5.1 (2009): 39–65. Web.

Harmanşah, Ömür. “ISIS, Heritage, and the Spectacles of Destruction in the Global Media.” *Near Eastern Archaeology* 78.3 (2015): 170–177. Print.

Herscher, Andrew. “Counter-Heritage and Violence.” *Future Anterior: Journal of Historic Preservation, History, Theory, and Criticism* 3.2 (2006): 24–33. Print.

Herscher, Andrew. “The Language of Damage.” *Grey Room* 7 (2002): 69–71. Print.

Howe, Zoë. “Can the 1954 Hague Convention Apply to Non-State Actors?: A Study of Iraq and Libya.” *Texas International Law Journal* 47.2 (2012): 403–425. Print.

Kaldor, Mary. *New and Old wars: Organised Violence in a Global Era*. 3rd ed. Cambridge: Polity Press. 2012

Keenan, Jeremy. “Looting the Sahara: The Material, Intellectual and Social Implications of the Destruction of Cultural Heritage (Briefing).” *Journal of North African Studies* 10.3/4 (2005): 471–489. Web.

Lababidi, Rim. “The International Protection of Cultural Heritage in Times of Conflict: Efficient or Deficient?” International Institute for Conservation of Historic and Artistic Works. N.p., 15 Feb. 2015. Web.

Laub, Zachary. “The Islamic State.” Council on Foreign Relations. N.p., 10 Aug. 2016. Web.

Nemeth, Erik. “Cultural Security: The Evolving Role of Art in International Security.” *Terrorism and Political Violence* 19.1 (2007): 19–42. Web.

Nickerson, Colin. “ISIS’ Archaeological Destruction Creates a New Dark Age - The Boston Globe.” *The Boston Globe*. N.p., 10 Mar. 2015. Web. 26 Feb. 2016.

Poloni-Staudinger, Lori, and Candice Ortbals. “Gendering Abbottabad: Agency and Hegemonic Masculinity in an Age of Global Terrorism.” *Gender Issues* 31.1 (2014): 34–57. Web.

Powell, Kimberlya. “Framing Islam: An Analysis of U.S. Media Coverage of Terrorism Since 9/11.” *Communication Studies* 62.1 (2011): 90–112. Web.

Prott, Lyndel V., and Patrick J. O’Keefe. “‘Cultural Heritage’ or ‘Cultural Property’?” *International Journal of Cultural Property* 1.2 (1992): 307–320. Web.

Reuben, Richard C. “Impact of News Coverage on Conflict: Toward Greater Understanding, The.” Marq. L. Rev. 93 (2009): 45. Print.

Scheufele, DA. “Framing as a Theory of Media Effects - Scheufele - 2006 - - Wiley Online Library.” *Journal of Communication* 49.1 (1999): 103–122. Print.

Stein, Gil J. “The War-Ravaged Cultural Heritage of Afghanistan: An Overview of Projects of Assessment, Mitigation, and Preservation.” *Near Eastern Archaeology* 78.3 (2015): 187–195. Print.

Semetko, Ha, and Pm Valkenburg. “Framing European Politics: A Content Analysis of Press and Television News.” Journal of Communication 50.2 (2000): 93–109. Wiley Online Library. Web.

Valkenburg, Patti M., Holli A. Semetko, and Claes H. De Vreese. “The Effects of News Frames on Readers’ Thoughts and Recall.” Communication Research 26.5 (1999): 550–569. crx.sagepub.com.mutex.gmu.edu. Web.

Vliegenthart, Rens, and Liesbet van Zoonen. “Power to the Frame: Bringing Sociology back to Frame Analysis.” *European Journal of Communication* 26.2 (2011): 101–115. Web.

Vrdoljak, Ana Filipa. *Cultural Heritage, Human Rights and the Privatisation of War*. Rochester, NY: Social Science Research Network, 2015. Web. 10 Mar. 2016.

Vrdoljak, Ana Filipa. *The Criminalisation of the Intentional Destruction of Cultural Heritage*. Rochester, NY: Social Science Research Network, 2015. Web. 10 Mar. 2016.

BIOGRAPHY

Morgan Cloud received her Bachelor of Arts in Anthropology from Longwood University in 2014. She enjoys traveling and digging holes