STUDY ON SITES ASSOCIATED WITH RECENT CONFLICTS AND OTHER NEGATIVE AND DIVISIVE MEMORIES

Olwen Beazley PhD and Christina Cameron PhD

May 2, 2020

TABLE OF CONTENTS

APPENDICES

Appendix A
DECISIONS FROM 42nd SESSION OF WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE (MANAMA, 2018)

Appendix B
BIBLIOGRAPHY

Appendix C
EXPERT MEETING ON SITES ASSOCIATED WITH RECENT CONFLICTS AND OTHER NEGATIVE AND DIVISIVE MEMORIES, PARIS 4-6 DECEMBER 2019

Appendix D
REVIEW GROUP FOR STUDY ON SITES ASSOCIATED WITH RECENT CONFLICTS AND OTHER NEGATIVE AND DIVISIVE MEMORIES

Appendix E
WORLD HERITAGE SITES ASSOCIATED WITH RECENT CONFLICTS AND OTHER NEGATIVE AND DIVISIVE MEMORIES INSCRIBED UNDER CRITERION (VI)

Appendix F
CHECKLIST OF QUESTIONS TO CONSIDER WHEN EMBARKING ON A MEMORIALIZATION PROJECT

STUDY ON SITES ASSOCIATED WITH RECENT CONFLICTS AND OTHER NEGATIVE AND DIVISIVE MEMORIES

Olwen Beazley PhD (Australia) and Christina Cameron PhD (Canada)

The views expressed in this Study are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views, or positions, of any individual State Party or government.

Part 1: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background and description of mandate

This independent study on sites associated with recent conflicts and other negative and divisive memories has been prepared at the request of the UNESCO World Heritage Centre with the financial support of the Republic of Korea. It responds to three decisions adopted by the World Heritage Committee in 2018. The three decisions use slightly different wording to identify the subject of this study: "sites associated with memories of recent conflicts," "sites associated with recent conflicts and other negative and divisive memories" and "sites associated with recent conflicts." Two of the decisions ask for a comprehensive reflection, while the third is more specific, calling for "philosophical and practical reflections on the nature of memorialization, the value of evolving memories, the inter-relationship between material and immaterial attributes in relation to memory, and the issue of stakeholder consultation" (see appendix A). In all three decisions, the Committee asks the fundamental question as to whether and how these sites might relate to the purpose and scope of the World Heritage Convention.

1.2 Work method and content of the study

This study draws on background documents and relevant studies related to sites of recent conflicts and the use of World Heritage inscription criterion (vi) as well as literature related to public history and memorialization (see appendix B). Specifically, the authors studied past decisions of the World Heritage Committee related to sites of conflict and other negative and divisive memories and consulted proceedings of World Heritage expert meetings on the subject. Three recent reports on sites of memory and World Heritage inscription criterion (vi) were of particular importance.[1] The study considered two key reports from the UN Human Rights Council on memorialization and history, as well as academic scholarship on public history and sites of memory together with literature that considers the concepts of transitional justice and Sites of Conscience. The study has also benefitted from the discussions of a World Heritage expert group meeting in December 2019 (see appendix C) and further review by some members of the expert group (see appendix D).

The study begins with previous and current forms of recognition of sites associated with recent conflicts and other negative and divisive memories. It then examines public history principles and practice, and concepts of memory, memorialization and history. It follows with considerations for using criterion (vi) for sites associated with recent conflicts, including both

ethical and practical issues. The study then reflects on the relationship of these sites to the purpose and scope of the World Heritage Convention and its *Operational Guidelines*, including a review of national values versus Outstanding Universal Value (OUV). It finishes with conclusions and recommendations.

1.3 Definitions: Sites of memory and Sites of Conscience

Providing a definition for sites of memory and Sites of Conscience, as used in the context of this study, is crucial for understanding the nuancing of the discussions set out in the following pages. While some sites of memory can also be Sites of Conscience, not all Sites of Conscience are sites of memory. The identification of sites as one or the other (or both) is central to the question of whether, or if, they should, or could, be included in UNESCO's World Heritage List. For the purposes of this discussion:

Sites of memory are public places where an event happened that a nation and its people (or at least some of them) want to remember. They are places that have not been constructed as memory sites or as memorials but as a result of events at the location and the desire for people to remember, they have become memory sites; they are 'unintentional monuments'.[2] These sites are not the nation-building monuments of old, with warriors on horses or kings on thrones celebrating victories, achievements and domination of nations. They are "a specific location with architectural or archaeological evidence, or even specific landscape aspects which can be linked to the memorial aspects of the place."[3] These sites can have a positive and/or a negative aspect.[4] Within this broad definition, and for the purpose of this study, they are sites that are associated with recent conflicts, negative and other divisive memories that commemorate the victims of human atrocities, the dispossessed and the dead. They include, but are not limited to, places associated with slavery, colonial domination, forced labour, oppressive regimes, internment and atrocity. These sites often have a dual purpose, as a private/sacred space for mourning and quiet reflection, and a public/educative space for education and potential reform of humanity at large to prevent future atrocities.[5]

Sites of Conscience are places that are the locus of, or associated with, events in history, including recent history; they are often sites of memory. The International Coalition of Sites of Conscience (ICSC) is a not-for-profit network of these sites, founded in 1999, and is a consultative body to the United Nations Economic and Social Council. The ICSC "recognizes that the power of sites of memory is not inherent; it must be harnessed as a deliberate tactic in the service of human rights and citizen engagement. This conscious effort to connect past to present and memory to action is the hallmark of the Sites of Conscience movement."[6] Sites of Conscience "highlight stories of cruelty, courage, or everyday life through public dialogue programs that seek to activate the sites' historical perspective by connecting them with issues we face today and by asking visitors to consider what role they might play in addressing these issues."[7] The ICSC deals with events both in the past, within living memory and with active loci of conflicts, such as work currently underway with the Rohingya in Myanmar and warring groups in South Sudan.[8] Sites of Conscience are sites that have made a commitment to education, interpreting history through the site, engaging in programs that stimulate dialogue on pressing social issues, promoting humanitarian and democratic values as a primary function, and sharing opportunities for public involvement in issues raised at the site.[9] The

Sites of Conscience relevant to this study are those that are associated with recent conflicts and other negative and divisive memories.

Part 2: THE RECOGNITION OF SITES ASSOCIATED WITH RECENT CONFLICTS AND OTHER NEGATIVE AND DIVISIVE MEMORIES

2.1 Past decisions on inscribing sites associated with recent conflicts and other negative and divisive memories on the World Heritage List

2.1.1 History of the application of criterion (vi)
Criterion (vi) operates differently from the other nine inscription criteria because it explicitly recognizes the "outstanding universal significance" of the associative dimension of World Heritage sites. While from a present-day perspective all criteria for assessing OUV are considered to have an associative dimension, criterion (vi) explicitly recognizes the "outstanding universal significance" of the associative dimension. Unlike the other nine criteria which assess the OUV of the *property itself*, criterion (vi) first assesses the *significance of the association(s)* followed by a second assessment of the *nature of the link between such associations(s) and the property*, and by a third assessment based on *comparison with other similar associations and their links to sites*.

The wording of criterion (vi) has been amended seven times in the *Operational Guidelines,[10]* primarily to restrict its use alone without other criteria and to add associations as new typologies were adopted. In 2005, the restrictive approach was softened somewhat, although the Committee still expressed a preference to use criterion (vi) in conjunction with other criteria. Unchanged since 2005, criterion (vi) requires a property to:

> be directly or tangibly associated with events or living traditions, with ideas, or
> with beliefs, with artistic and literary works of outstanding universal significance
> (The Committee considers that this criterion should preferably be used in
> conjunction with other criteria).[11]

From the six associations itemized in criterion (vi) (events, living traditions, ideas, beliefs, artistic works, literary works), "events" and "ideas" are the two associations most frequently used for sites of conflict and other negative and divisive memories. Currently, 246 World Heritage sites have been inscribed using criterion (vi); twelve have used criterion (vi) alone. In other words, the vast majority of properties inscribed under criterion (vi) have also been listed under other inscription criteria.

2.1.2 Concerns of the World Heritage Committee about inclusion of sites associated with recent conflicts and other negative and divisive memories on the World Heritage List
Following the first round of inscriptions in 1978 and faced with over eighty cultural nominations in the queue, the World Heritage Committee asked its Rapporteur, Michel Parent, to undertake a comparative study of the criteria to make sure they were strong enough to prevent an unreasonable number of inscriptions. Parent's 1979 review was wide-ranging, including a discussion of places with positive and negative historical values. He defined these

places as "areas which may have no tangible cultural property on them but which have been the scene of an important historical event. Such an event may be for the good of humanity … or it may live on in people's memory as a dreadful warning against any recurrence of the events which took place there." Parent agreed that the concept of listing "an 'idea' which haunts a historic place" is consistent with the letter of the Convention but warned against potential divisiveness.[12]

In his report, Parent astutely recommended that places of positive and negative values should stand as *symbols* for a series of similar sites, thereby emphasizing the aspect of universality. "Sites representing the positive and negative sides of human history will only be invested with real force if we make the most remarkable into unique symbols, each one standing for the whole series of similar events."[13] Using the nomination of Auschwitz as his example, he emphasized that "in order to preserve its symbolic status as a monument to all the victims, Auschwitz should, it seems, remain in isolation. In other words, we recommend that it should stand alone among cultural properties as bearing witness to the depth of horror and of suffering, and the height of heroism, and that all other sites of the same nature be symbolised through it."[14]

The 1979 session of the World Heritage Committee established the **principle of exceptionality, i.e. one site standing as a symbol for a series of similar sites**. In line with Parent's advice, the Committee decided "to enter Auschwitz concentration camp as a unique site and to restrict the inscription of other sites of a similar nature."[15]

The Committee also acknowledged that listing places associated with events and people could lead to political and nationalist difficulties and thus undermine the objectives and purpose of the World Heritage Convention.

> Particular attention should be given to cases which fall under criterion (vi) so that the net result would not be a reduction in the value of the List, due to the large potential number of nominations as well as to political difficulties. Nominations concerning, in particular, historical events or famous people could be strongly influenced by nationalism or other particularisms in contradiction with the objectives of the World Heritage Convention.[16]

These discussions led to the 1980 amendment of the wording of criterion (vi) which eliminated the eligibility of persons, replaced "historical" with "universal" significance and added "directly or tangibly" to reinforce the tangible aspect of sites consistent with this property-based Convention. In dealing with subsequent proposals for inscription of sites of associative values, the Committee has continued to regard them as exceptional cases, in line with the constraints placed on the use of criterion (vi) in successive versions of the *Operational Guidelines*.

This study has identified eighteen World Heritage sites associated with recent conflicts and other negative and divisive memories that have been listed under criterion (vi) (appendix E). Among them, only four properties can be considered to meet the definition of sites of recent conflicts, the principal thrust of the three decisions of the 2018 session of the World Heritage

Committee (see 1.1). The expert meeting in December 2019 adopted a working definition of "recent conflicts." While acknowledging that in some cases negative memories can endure for centuries, the meeting considered "recent" to be "from the turn of the twentieth century" and "conflict" to cover "events such as wars, battles, massacres, genocide, torture and mass violations."[17] The table in appendix E demonstrates just how exceptional these cases are. After more than forty years of listing, only eighteen World Heritage sites can be clearly identified as fitting the broad category of sites associated with recent conflicts and other negative and divisive memories (1.6 per cent of 1121 World Heritage sites currently on the List) and only four properties as sites of "recent conflicts" (0.4 per cent).

2.1.3 Recent studies on sites of memory and the application of criterion (vi)
Three research studies have recently examined the subject. The International Coalition of Sites of Conscience undertook a study on *Interpretation of Sites of Memory* (2018) that sets out principles of ethical interpretation practice and methods to mediate divergent views for mutual understanding. This report provides guidance for an all-compassing interpretation scheme for sites of memory that is truthful and knowledge-based.[18]

Under the direction of the Canada Research Chair on Built Heritage at the University of Montreal, Christina Cameron and Judith Herrmann prepared a report on *Guidance and capacity building for the recognition of associative values using World Heritage criterion (vi)* (2018), a follow-up to the 2012 expert meeting in Warsaw on this subject. The comprehensive inventories in this report reveal that, for sites of conflict and other negative and divisive memories, the Committee has tended to adopt value statements that acknowledge specific injustices and go further to explain how such properties stand as symbols or examples of universal principles, such as liberation, advances in civil rights, anti-slavery efforts, democracy, reconciliation and peace.[19]

The third report is the ICOMOS discussion paper prepared for the World Heritage Committee on *Evaluations of World Heritage Nominations related to sites associated with memories of recent conflicts* (2018). The range of issues and technical challenges presented by ICOMOS led the Committee to call for the organisation of an expert meeting on sites associated with recent conflicts and other negative and divisive memories in December 2019.[20] The meeting reached the following conclusion. "With regard to sites associated with recent conflicts and other negative and divisive memories, the experts consider that such properties do not relate to the purpose and scope of the World Heritage Convention and its *Operational Guidelines*, although there are properties that were previously inscribed on an exceptional basis, especially in the early years of the Convention."[21]

2.2 Transitional justice and Sites of Conscience

2.2.1 Concept of transitional justice and memorialization
The term transitional justice "refers to the set of judicial and non-judicial measures that have been implemented by different countries in order to redress the legacies of massive human rights abuses. These measures include criminal prosecutions, truth commissions, reparations programs, and various kinds of institutional reforms."[22] This framework to "facilitate

processes of reconciliation and healing" came about in the 1980s and 1990s to help countries coming out of periods of violence and oppression.[23]

There is a clear, and often formalised, recognition of sites associated with recent conflicts and other negative and divisive memories through transitional justice processes entered into by countries where human rights abuses have taken place. The "measure" of transitional justice relevant to this study is that of reparations programs. The International Centre for Transitional Justice states that reparation can be individual, collective, material and symbolic.[24] Within the frame of symbolic reparations, it is increasingly recognised that memory and memorialization are "an integral part of any transitional justice process that seeks to set the historical record straight. Post-conflict memorialization has come to fall under the rubric of reparations as a category of symbolic reparations that seek to recognize victims and contribute to the broader reconciliation process."[25]

Evidence is found in numerous truth and reconciliation commissions that recommended that States, as part of the reparative measures, commemorate victims of human rights abuses through memorialization initiatives, it being important for victims to be recognised and for society to remember what happened.[26] Examples can be found in El Salvador, Germany, Guatemala, Peru, Morocco, South Africa and Chad.[27] These recommendations often prevent governments from destroying buildings where human rights abuses have taken place, and therefore help protect the memories associated with them.[28] Transitional justice measures and memorialization have also been recognised through various branches within the United Nations (UN). For example, Louis Joinet, former Special Rapporteur of the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities made the following statement:

> On a collective basis, symbolic measures intended to provide moral reparation, such as formal public recognition by the State of its responsibility, or official declarations aimed at restoring victims' dignity, commemorative ceremonies, naming of public thoroughfares or the **erection of monuments, help to discharge the duty of remembrance**.[29]

What this means is that the UN, in its various operations, has recognised the requirement for victim reparations, including the creation of monuments/memorials. Of special interest to this study is that some of these monuments/memorials have now appeared on the Tentative Lists of States Parties to the World Heritage Convention. This, in turn, has prompted the question from the World Heritage Committee as to whether and how these sites might relate to the purpose and scope of the World Heritage Convention.

For a memorial to function as a site of reparation and for the memorialization process to perform as an act of transitional justice, there must be what the International Coalition of Sites of Conscience calls "truth seeking and accountability."[30] This requires the memorialization process to ensure the inclusivity of memories of all stakeholders in order to assist them in trying to come to terms with their dissonant histories and move towards reconciliation (see 4.1.1). This requirement is central to the issue of how the intrinsic partiality of narratives of sites of memory associated with recent conflicts may be addressed through memorialization initiatives, and how that may relate to individual sites nominated to the World Heritage List

and the concept of Outstanding Universal Value. This is particularly important because while "memorials may serve as catalysts for healing since they have the potential to recognize the atrocities experienced by survivors, re-integrate survivors into the historical realm and set the record straight,"[31] there is also the risk that "transitional justice mechanisms may be more divisive than conciliatory, as they may fuel divisions between victims and perpetrators."[32] The success of memorialization initiatives, as part of transitional justice mechanisms, is likely to rest on the nature of the process that is undertaken, when it is undertaken, who is included in the process and how it relates to other forms of post-conflict reparations as part of transitional justice processes. [33]

2.2.2 Concept of Sites of Conscience and memorialization

Sites of Conscience can be historic sites, museums and memorials. Sometimes they are created as a result of the reparations undertaken through transitional justice processes. They are powerful repositories of memory and provide spaces for civic engagement around the memories of past events. They are often the actual buildings or sites where acts of torture and human rights abuses occurred, including sites like the ESMA (*Escuela Superior de Mecanica de la Armanda*) in Argentina or the Villa Grimaldi Peace Park in Chile. Sometimes they are repurposed buildings serving as Sites of Conscience, such as the Partition Museum, Amritsar, India or the District Six Museum in South Africa. There is currently only one site of memory, also a Site of Conscience, on the World Heritage List: the Island of Gorée (Senegal) (see part 4). This site of memory serves as a Site of Conscience in telling the stories of what happened there, connecting those stories of the past to their contemporary legacies and committing to, through public education and discourse, ensuring that such events never happen again.

Sites of Conscience, as places of memory, are intended to be widely accessible spaces where communities can come together to remember or learn about what happened in the recent or distant past, and further explore how those events relate to contemporary human rights challenges. They are places where all members of society, including victims, survivors and governments, show their commitment to "connect past to present, memory to action."[34] They are sites that have made a commitment to education, interpreting history through physical sites, engaging in programs that stimulate dialogue on pressing social issues, promoting humanitarian and democratic values as a primary function, and sharing opportunities for public involvement in issues raised at the site.[35]

Education plays a vital role in helping to influence opinion, attitudes and behaviours.[36] It is also understood that educational outreach, as part of transitional justice, has a long-lasting impact beyond that of the work of the international courts and tribunals formed to assist in the delivery of transitional justice. It is important that outreach work be interactive and participatory.[37] Closely associated with the role of education and relevant to this study is a recent report by the International Coalition of Sites of Conscience entitled *Interpretation of Sites of Memory* that identifies the opportunities and the challenges in the important role that interpretation plays at sites of memory.[38] Many sites employ interactive spaces for visitors to be challenged, to reflect and, through this process, to learn.

The International Coalition of Sites of Conscience states that "memorialization initiatives can take place during all phases of conflict; however, much of the success of post-conflict memorialization depends on the processes that are undertaken in developing the initiative."[39] The Coalition's *Toolkit for Memorialization in Post-Conflict Societies* (Toolkit) lists key factors for communities considering a memorialization effort, and presents them as a "checklist of questions to consider when embarking on a memorialization project"[40] (see appendix F). Prior to any consideration of sites associated with recent conflicts and other negative and divisive memories for inclusion on the World Heritage List, it would be important for a memorialization initiative, such as that outlined by the International Coalition of Sites of Conscience, to be in place (see part 4).

Part 3: PUBLIC HISTORY PERSPECTIVE

3.1 What is public history?

According to the International Federation for Public History, "public history is a field in the historical sciences made up of professionals who undertake historical work in a variety of public and private settings for different kinds of audiences. The settings in which they work, often with the public, may include international and transnational organizations, governments at all levels, as well as local, regional, or national non-profit, corporate, cultural and educational institutions."[41] Public history is the process of making historical research accessible and relevant to a non-academic audience. Sometimes called applied history, it is history as it is experienced by and interpreted for the public. Public history develops narratives of the past based on scholarly research. These narratives are presented to the public at physical places like museums and historic sites, or virtually through web-based programming, films and other multimedia productions. The creation of World Heritage sites and their interpretation programs are manifestations of public history and subject to the principles and practices of this field.

3.2 Concepts of historical thinking

The discipline of history uses established theories and methodologies to produce sound scholarship based on verifiable evidence. Public historians gather and weigh different kinds of evidence, including a wide range of material culture, visual, oral, digital, written and other traditional and non-traditional forms of historical evidence. In understanding the past, they consider different contexts and time scales for interpreting the available evidence.

Historical significance is about establishing meaning in the past. A key concept in historical thinking is the recognition that history is written from a specific worldview. In establishing meaning, it is critical to take into consideration the values, beliefs and potential bias of those who decide on what is significant.

Historical thinking has at its core an understanding that interpretations of the past are constantly evolving. Through an on-going process, the meanings of historical events are re-evaluated in light of new evidence as well as different perspectives and changes in society.

Just as with any significant shared body of knowledge, history is always undergoing re-examination and reconsideration. Given the seriousness of this work, it is important to approach history as a science and academic discipline.

3.3 Principles of public history

Among the most important principles relating to the conduct of historical research are the recognition of evolving narratives of the past and the awareness of bias. The UN Special Rapporteur in the field of cultural rights raises this issue in her thoughtful 2013 report on writing and teaching history. She acknowledges that "history is always subject to differing interpretations. While events may be proven, including in a court of law, historical narratives are viewpoints that, by definition, are partial. Accordingly, even when the facts are undisputed, conflicting parties may nevertheless fiercely debate moral legitimacy and the idea of who was right and who was wrong. Provided that historical narratives rigorously follow the highest deontological standards, they should be respected and included in the debate."[42]

The UN Special Rapporteur points to the critical need for the highest ethical standards for public historians when dealing with evolving narratives and contested histories. Professional conduct for public history requires the application of established research theories and methods appropriate to the situation and reference to existing scholarship from all pertinent disciplines. Public history strives to be culturally inclusive, basing research on primary and secondary sources that reflect the full range of voices, perspectives and experiences involved in the topic. In response to new evidence and changes in society, interpretation of past events requires discussion and periodic re-evaluation. Public history also requires awareness that historical narratives are written from the worldview of the researchers and can therefore be potentially biased. Professional codes of ethics require that rigorous scientific research be carried out with accuracy, objectivity, inclusiveness, impartiality, fairness and respect.[43]

3.4 Practice of public history

Best practice in public history includes taking into account multiple and diverse voices in order to explore the full spectrum of evidence from written documents to powerful memories attached to heritage places. Critical thinking and analysis are essential skills to foster an understanding of the past as well as contemporary challenges such as discrimination and violence. Practitioners of public history are required to demonstrate their understanding that interpretations of the past are constantly evolving and that the context and timeframe chosen affect the determination of values. Their challenge is to distinguish manipulations of history for political or other ends from the legitimate continuous reinterpretation of the past.

The UN Special Rapporteur in the field of cultural rights draws on her findings to issue a stark warning about current practice: "History teaching should aim at fostering critical thought, analytic learning and debate; stressing the complexity of history, it should enable a comparative and multi-perspective approach. It should not serve the purpose of strengthening patriotism, fortifying national identity or shaping the young in line with either the official ideology or the guidelines of the dominant religion."[44]

In a subsequent panel discussion, she explained that good practice "enabling a plurality of narratives of past events is particularly crucial in post-conflict and deeply divided societies, because it allows insights into the experience of the other, whoever it may be, and a glimpse of people's common humanity beyond the fractured identities that are especially prominent in conflict."[45]

In line with these observations, public history provides a platform to address conflict and controversy in a way that encourages dialogue and the development of mutual understanding. Practitioners in public history recognize that narratives are written from specific worldviews and that power dynamics affect understandings of heritage places. As a result, practitioners follow professional codes of ethics to address potential bias and to understand how values and beliefs influence perspectives on the past.

3.5 What does a public history perspective mean for World Heritage?

World Heritage activities fall within the scope of public history. Key among the implications is the requirement for research to be inclusive, both in the sources consulted and the people involved. Whenever historical research is used in nomination dossiers or in interpretation activities at World Heritage sites, it should draw on multiple perspectives in an accurate, inclusive and impartial manner.

Another implication is the tension that arises between the values established at the time of inscription of a World Heritage site through its Statement of Outstanding Universal Value (SOUV) and the multiple, evolving or contested values associated with multiple stakeholders. Shifting values and understandings of the past, especially for sites of recent conflicts and sites of memory, present a challenge for the fixed values set out at one point in time in the SOUVs.

A third implication is the particular vulnerability of sites associated with recent conflicts to being manipulated by political parties and other interest groups with divisive agendas. To counter potential manipulation, the application of a professional code of conduct and external participation in preparing research materials are advisable.

Part 4: MEMORY, MEMORIALIZATION AND HISTORY

4.1 Memorialization

4.1.1 Increase in memorialization
In her report on memorialization processes, the UN Special Rapporteur in the field of cultural rights states that the rise in memorialization is due to a concept that emerged in the 1980s, that of the duty to remember mass crimes. This concept "asserts the legitimacy of seeking reparation and drawing lessons even centuries after the actual events."[46]

Specifically, since the 1980s "the creation of memorials has become linked to the idea that ensuring public recognition of past crimes is indispensable to the victims, essential for

preventing further violence and necessary for redefining national unity."[47] There has been a growth of a worldwide memory discourse, in concert with the recognition of crimes against humanity in countries such as Poland, Argentina, Rwanda, Cambodia and others.[48] Some early examples on the World Heritage List are Auschwitz Birkenau (Poland), Robben Island (South Africa), Aapravasi Ghat (Mauritius) and recently Valongo Wharf (Brazil) (see appendix E).

According to the UN Special Rapporteur, the increase in memorialization became "institutionalized between 1997 and 2005 … propelling States exiting conflicts or periods of repression to engage in active memorial policies, using increasingly similar modalities. Western memorial models commemorating the victims of Nazism, while not always the most adequate or appropriate, have become the template or at least a political and aesthetic inspiration for the representation of past tragedies or mass crimes."[49] The memorialization of victims of mass human rights abuses around the world has been identified as a paradigm shift in memorialization and "how societies represent the past in public spaces."[50] This phenomenon has been termed a "global culture of memory."[51] With it, a new form of memorialization has emerged as an activity of remembrance, to recall the victims of recent conflicts and other negative and divisive memories.

The recent and increasing acts of memorialization are seen to be very important, and often central to struggles for human rights, reparations and democracy in post-conflict societies.[52] They are also seen by many as vehicles for post-conflict reconciliation and, through this performance, able to support coherent national narratives for emerging governments and societies. Research in this field has shown, however, that while memorialization can assist in reconciliation it can also, if not done inclusively and at an appropriate time, highlight dissonance around what should be remembered and in what way.[53]

There is a clear connection between the increase in memorialization of these types of sites and symbolic reparations for victims undertaken through transitional justice activities.[54] Some memorialization is successfully done at a grass-roots level, outside the formal instruments of transitional justice, by impacted social groups.[55] Other memorialization is undertaken by the State as part of its formal obligations to address human rights abuses in its territories (see part 2).

Another reason for an increase in memorialization at any given time, and not necessarily linked to transitional justice processes, is temporal and explained by memory theorists as being related to a fear of forgetting. They have asked "why this obsession with memory and the past and why this fear of forgetting?"[56] This question is pivotal to the issue of the inclusion of places of memory on the World Heritage List. It has been defined as 'temporal anchoring' in a digital age which is moving ever faster and causing the clear structure of time and place to collapse.[57] Sites of memory have been included on, and are nominated to, the World Heritage List in order to protect against the loss of memory of a particular event, often to bolster national identity. This fear of forgetting is particularly relevant in relation to the memories associated with the global conflicts of World Wars I and II. The progressing age of surviving veterans of World War II appears to be linked to the start of commemorative events, such as anniversary celebrations, together with forms of physical commemoration to assist in generational memory

transfer, including the act of memorialization.[58] This is closely related to a concept called the "edge of memory" (see 4.2.1).[59]

4.1.2 *"Never Again" memorialization and prevention*

Memorialization, as an outcome of symbolic reparations through transitional justice processes, is closely related to attempts to ensure non-repetition of human rights abuses in the countries where they are located. The UN Special Rapporteur concludes that "memorialization as a contribution to guarantees of non-recurrence demands that the past inform the present and facilitate the understanding of contemporary issues relating to democracy, human rights and equality."[60] The transformation of some sites of memory into educative and interactive spaces, places to learn and advocate for peace as well as places for remembering victims, has led to their establishment as Sites of Conscience (see 2.2).

One of the goals of Sites of Conscience is to ensure "non-repetition" of the traumatic events being remembered. One justification for creating memorials, including Sites of Conscience, is the desire to "learn from the past" and "never again" repeat the same atrocities/human rights abuses.[61] This prevention of recurrence can be achieved if civil society and governments coalesce around a shared vision for a rights-based future. Such a process can be lengthy and non-linear, but core to its success are inclusivity, a respect for different experiences and perspectives, and a commitment to education, all of which are hallmarks of Sites of Conscience programs.

It is the physical remains of sites of memory, and their association with an event, that enable them to perform as mnemonics of memory, aides of memory, and for "intensified remembering" to take place.[62] Without the physical remains of sites of memory, the process of remembering would be more difficult and less focused. The creation of memorials out of physical remains associated with an event, such as at Robben Island (South Africa), and the interpretation of these remains, are processes through which States aim to prevent similar atrocities from occurring again. This is the non-repetition component of transitional justice. It is not, however, enough for sites of memory just to exist and elicit memories. They must also engage new generations in human rights discourses to try to prevent future atrocities and, in so doing, sites of memory may also become Sites of Conscience.

The declaration of "never again" came after World War I but, in the late 1990s, was renewed through the transitional justice model.[63] It has been acknowledged, however, that the objective of "never again" is difficult to achieve.[64] For example, it has been noted that "transitional justice has not uprooted racism in post-apartheid South Africa, nor has it promoted social equality."[65] What might be taught, and learned, by a society at one Site of Conscience about a human rights abuse or genocide may not have the power of global transference. A further point to consider is that memorial practices, while trying to ensure non-repetition of crimes against humanity, can also perform as "memorial tyrannies."[66] An example of memorial tyranny occurs when numerous memorials to the same event do not include dissonant and alternate narratives and, with this exclusion, leave little or no space for a multiplicity of experiences and memories to be articulated.[67]

4.1.3 World Heritage sites as Sites of Conscience

In 1999, the International Coalition of Sites of Conscience developed the concept of Sites of Conscience as a type of site performing certain educational and human rights endeavours (see part 2). The concept postdates the inscription of the Island of Gorée (Senegal, 1978), Auschwitz-Birkenau (Poland, 1979) and the Hiroshima Peace Memorial (Genbaku Dome) (Japan, 1996) and was created the same year that Robben Island (South Africa, 1999) was inscribed on the World Heritage List. Of the eighteen World Heritage sites of negative and divisive memories inscribed under criterion (vi) (see appendix E), only the Island of Gorée is currently recognized as a Site of Conscience.

The Island of Gorée was a founding member of the International Coalition of Sites of Conscience. It actively promotes truth-telling, democracy and human rights. It was inscribed on the World Heritage List for its association with an event in history and an idea assessed as being of outstanding universal significance, but also because, through those events and ideas of "never again" it could educate future generations on how to ensure these kinds of events are not repeated. It stands as a testimony to one of the greatest tragedies in the history of human society: the slave trade. The question for the World Heritage Committee is whether it seeks to include more sites of memory, that could also be Sites of Conscience, on the World Heritage List and if so, what is the motivation?

4.1.4 Work necessary for registration as a Site of Conscience

The International Coalition of Sites of Conscience's toolkit *From Memory to Action: Toolkit for Memorialization in Post-Conflict Societies* (Toolkit) provides some examples for how communities might undertake memorialization efforts.[68] It emphasises that memorialization initiatives are inherently political and that, if not done sensitively and inclusively, through extensive community-led consultation, they may, if fact, deepen fissures in already divided societies and could be a threat to post-conflict reconstruction. It also identifies that the consultation process, rather than the final product, is the most important element in terms of symbolic reparations for the victims.[69]

The UN Special Rapporteur in the field of cultural rights cautions that "memorialization processes are emancipatory only when all sides, the political sequences and consequences of events are remembered and when the community and especially key stakeholders are able to have a voice in crafting the development of transitional justice strategies."[70] Sites associated with recent conflict and other negative and divisive memories have multiple narratives and two, or sometimes more, dominant narratives. In considering them for inclusion on the World Heritage List, attention should be given to the possible presence of dissonant memories that have not been collected or included in the memorialization process.

The actions and outcomes of a memorialization project in post-conflict reconstruction are listed in the Sites of Conscience Toolkit. The process of memorialization, as a form of reparation in support of transitional justice, is to promote reconciliation within the post-conflict society, helping communities come to terms with the past to achieve a transformative vision for the future. The creation of memorials can be a way to foster reconciliation in a post-

conflict society. Information from the Northern Ireland Human Rights Commission notes that "developing new cultural symbols, which shift identities from defensive to empowered, aides [sic] in establishing a new notion of community and helps to eradicate polarizing images and stereotypes that fuel discrimination. Cultural symbols can be used as tools to formulate a symbolic landscape that promotes unified and empowered collective identities."[71]

The Toolkit identifies that key stakeholder involvement and representation in a memorialization process are critical to its potential success, even though there are certain to be contested perspectives at a site of memory.[72] It is how those divisive memories are mediated and represented that will dictate the success of the project. Of note, in relation to potential national memorial narratives, consultation with key and multiple stakeholders is said to be imperative in order to foster trust and build democratic ways of working together in a post-conflict society. Of critical importance to the consideration of sites associated with recent conflicts and other negative and divisive memories on the World Heritage List are the following two points from the Toolkit checklist (see appendix F):

- Goals: What is the goal of the initiative? Is it to recognize survivors and victims? Does it foster reconciliation? Will it promote civic engagement and contribute to democracy-building processes? Is it a part of ongoing truth-telling processes? Will it focus on education for non-repetition of the past?

- Timing and Sequencing: Are stakeholders ready to participate in the project? Is the public ready to engage in the issues that the project raises or will the project bring underlying, unresolved tensions to the fore? How does the project relate to other transitional justice and post-conflict reconstruction mechanisms? Does it build on recommendations from a truth commission process?

All the considerations in the Toolkit checklist are relevant to this study as they identify the complexities of memorialization initiatives for sites of recent conflicts and other negative and divisive memories. In relation to the purpose and scope of the World Heritage Convention, it would be advantageous for sites to demonstrate that they have been through this, or a similar process, before inclusion in a State Party's World Heritage Tentative List.

The Northern Ireland report states that "ongoing cultural contestation is inevitable and needs to be managed rather than eradicated."[73] This being the case, then the work to reach a point of reconciliation, or a point where the contestation is managed, with all the key stakeholders should have been undertaken and a point of agreement reached on the stories and memories being told, and how they are being told. Without this robust approach, tried and tested by the International Coalition of Sites of Conscience, places of recent conflicts nominated to the World Heritage List could precipitate discord and violence instead of peace, reconciliation and democracy. The UN Commissioner for Human Rights reports that "some States warned that biased historical narratives coupled with a lack of shared memories of past events could result in further atrocities."[74]

4.1.5 Sites of Conscience as World Heritage

Are sites of memory, but also Sites of Conscience, eligible for inclusion on the World Heritage List?[*] The answer to this question must be based on the application of World Heritage criteria and whether such sites meet the threshold of being associated with events or ideas of outstanding universal significance in criterion (vi). This is the first threshold that any proposed site would have to meet. The association must be of outstanding universal significance, not just national or regional.

So far, the World Heritage Committee has listed only one site of memory, that later became a Site of Conscience, the Island of Gorée (see 4.1.3). If States Parties want to have other potential Sites of Conscience recognised on the World Heritage List, what are the necessary processes and timeframes that need to be in place before these sites could be considered?

The UN Special Rapporteur in the field of cultural rights comments that memorialization can begin even before a conflict is over but cautions that this timeframe does not allow "the process of reflection to come to maturity."[75] Without a period of time both to reflect and for dissonant narratives to be resolved, early inscription could promote division and further conflict (see part 5).

Would it be inappropriate to consider sites of memory and Sites of Conscience on the World Heritage List when dissonant memories at these sites may still be unresolved and reconciliation at the sites is still a work in progress?

4.2 What is the difference between sites of memory and sites of history?

When do sites of memory transition to sites of history?[76] When do they become historical markers? What happens when they move primarily from one role to the other?

Historian Pierre Nora has argued that to maintain memories, whether personal or collective, there must be a concerted effort to remember, and that without such an action, sites of memory will become sites of history, and will lack the "embodiment of memorial consciousness" unique to sites of memory.[77] This shift, as Nora observes, is a "slipping out of collective memory" into "historical memory."[78] Collective memory only remains politically effective (and by that one means associated with the events) if it retains its engagement with individual memories.[79] When the individual memories are no longer alive to engage with and inform the collective memory, and no re-creation of public memory has taken place, then the meaning and values of the sites change and become no longer current, but historical.

---

[*] At the time of writing this study, there are two places related to Sites of Conscience on States Parties' Tentative Lists: Memorial Sites of Genocide: Nyamata, Murabi, Bisesero and Gisozi (Gisozi being also known as the Kigali Genocide Memorial), Rwanda, and ESMA Site Museum – Former Clandestine Centre of Detention, Torture and Extermination (Argentina). As a member of the International Coalition of Sites of Conscience, the ESMA Museum in Argentina has sought to achieve reconciliation and the inclusion of dissonant memories in the telling of its history and the history of the period. The Kigali Genocide Memorial in Rwanda is also a Site of Conscience and has done work on its educational exhibition with a goal of non-repetition and continual dialogue. At the time of writing, it is unclear whether the other Memorial Sites of the Genocide on Rwanda's Tentative list (Nyamata, Murabi, Bisesero) have also done the work of reconciliation and truth-telling.

A possible example of a State Party attempting to restore memories may be the nomination of the Island of Gorée (Senegal) to the World Heritage List. This could demonstrate an attempt to restore what Ricoeur has called "wounded memory," a memory that has been weakened and cannot be recreated in a collective way.[80] Such a wounding would occur when descendants of the slaves shipped from Gorée could not recreate a memory of the event. "Wounded memory expresses the absence of verbalization – hence, a state of being unthought yet present."[81] It may have been an attempt to repossess and recreate a collective memory to assist the creation of identity for a traumatised nation. This is what Ricoeur has called "instrumentalized memory."[82]

4.2.1 Edge of Memory

The moment that memory begins to be lost, when individuals holding that memory begin to die, has been termed the "edge of memory."[83] It is at this juncture that events of national significance, such as wars and battles, begin to be commemorated in physical ways.[84]

David Lowenthal, American historian and geographer, has explained this moment in time, this edge of memory and the memorialization that follows:

> …communities deeply dependent on collective memory strive desperately to immortalize them against the fading memory…as eyewitnesses to victimhood pass away, we generate a host of surrogate reminders, lest our descendants forget or disown what Auschwitz and Hiroshima, Masada and Port Arthur meant to our ancestors and ourselves.[85]

It has been said that memorials "exist in a space between history and memory…between past, present and future."[86] These observations about the "edge of memory," "surrogate reminders" and the "space between history and memory" are all highly relevant to the memorialization of events, and endeavours by States Parties to have places associated with them included on the World Heritage List.

Sites of memory that have a strong educational focus, with multimedia ways of sharing information including videos, artefacts, photographs, demonstrate how as a society we try to find ways to transfer the information about what happened in the past into the future. It is this "edge of memory" and how it influences particular nominations to the World Heritage List that will be considered in the following section.

4.2.2 World Wars I and II memorials and sites of memory

During the nineteenth century, public memorialization through the construction of monuments typically celebrated the victories of nations in order to create national narratives.[87] The late nineteenth century saw the advent of war memorials with the names of fallen soldiers inscribed on them, including those from the Franco-Prussian war[88] and the British Afghan campaign of 1879-80.[89] In the twentieth and twenty-first centuries, however, memorialization has taken on a different, even more public form; it was the memorials of World Wars I and II that took commemoration into this realm. They demonstrate mourning in a very public, rather than a private, way. The memorials of World War I were the beginning of the "victim-driven emphasis on memorialization."[90] Although very public in their format, the World War I

memorials also provide what has been called a "private or sacred space," a place where families and friends can mourn privately and can try to come to terms with their loss.[91]

Increasing numbers of World War I and II sites are appearing on States Parties' Tentative Lists. This may be happening now, rather than ten years ago, because these events are on the "edge of memory." Collectively as a society, States Parties are seeking not to forget these significant events in history and to collectively remember them. Current Tentative Lists record World War I sites in Belgium, France, Slovenia and Turkey, and World War II sites in France and the Russian Federation.

World War I cenotaphs, constructed to commemorate the soldiers who died in combat, were, at the time of their construction, "intentional" public monuments. They can also be defined as sites of memory, not because of the monuments but because of the battlefields on which they stand. They are, however, not Sites of Conscience as the monuments themselves - rather than the broader peace and education initiatives related to the historical events at the sites - do not have an emphasis on education and a mission to link the past with the present in order to seek non-repetition of warfare on this scale. Instead, the monuments emphasize mourning and reflection. Although all survivors of World War I are now dead, the monuments still perform as the locus of memory and, through special remembrance ceremonies, have become the focus of collective memory.

4.2.3 Reflections
With an increase in public memorialization at sites of memory, the suitability of sites of recent conflicts and other negative and divisive memories for inclusion on the World Heritage List needs to be examined. Is there capacity in the process and policy of the machinery of World Heritage, or a robust heritage philosophy, that supports the World Heritage List becoming a "memory terrain"[92] for events in history of universal significance related to war, genocide and human rights abuses? If sites of recent conflicts and other negative and divisive memories are being proposed for inscription, then these contemporary interests needed to be considered through the lens of World Heritage process and policy.

It must be emphasised that sites associated with recent conflicts and other negative or divisive memories are eligible for inscription under criterion (vi) if they are associated with an event or idea of outstanding universal significance, albeit reflecting what Parent called in his 1979 report negative historical value.[93] Many sites will strive to articulate a concept that ICOMOS, at the World Heritage expert group meeting in December 2019, discussed as "mirrored values." These are often the ideas of reconciliation, democracy, human rights, ultimately striving towards non-repetition of atrocities and world peace. The articulation of these "mirrored values", these associative ideas, through education and interpretation at sites of recent conflicts and other negative and divisive memories, while desirable, should not be the sole reason for inscribing them on the World Heritage List. These ideas must be associated with a physical place.

Part 5: CONSIDERATIONS FOR USING CRITERION (vi) FOR SITES ASSOCIATED WITH RECENT CONFLICTS AND OTHER NEGATIVE AND DIVISIVE MEMORIES

5.1 Objectives of UNESCO and the World Heritage Convention

UNESCO's role within the UN system is to foster world peace, education, democracy and reconciliation among peoples and nations. The preamble to its Constitution states "that the wide diffusion of culture, and the education of humanity for justice and liberty and peace are indispensable to the dignity of man." Further, it declares "that a peace based exclusively upon the political and economic arrangements of governments would not be a peace which could secure the unanimous, lasting and sincere support of the peoples of the world, and that the peace must therefore be founded, if it is not to fail, upon the intellectual and moral solidarity of mankind."[94]

According to its preamble, the purpose of the World Heritage Convention is to establish "an effective system of collective protection of the cultural and natural heritage of outstanding universal value, organized on a permanent basis and in accordance with modern scientific methods."[95] With conservation as the ultimate goal, the World Heritage system begins with the identification of eligible properties. The Convention clearly states that the threshold for the identification of such properties is OUV. However, while the term occurs thirteen times in the Convention text, it is not defined. The determination of OUV is left to the judgement of the World Heritage Committee using "such criteria as it shall have established."[96]

Since the beginning, the Committee has developed and applied ten criteria for inscribing properties on the World Heritage List. It was only in 2005 that it adopted a formal definition of OUV:

> Outstanding Universal Value means cultural and/or natural significance which is so exceptional as to transcend national boundaries and to be of common importance for present and future generations of all humanity. As such, the permanent protection of this heritage is of the highest importance to the international community as a whole. The Committee defines the criteria for the inscription of properties on the World Heritage List.[97]

From the outset, the creators of the Convention recognized that it was not operationally feasible to list all potential sites. Instead, they envisaged a selective international list of exceptional sites.[98] Since 1978, the *Operational Guidelines* have consistently cautioned against listing every example of a phenomenon or typology: "The Convention is not intended to ensure the protection of all properties of great interest, importance or value, but only for a select list of the most outstanding of these from an international viewpoint."[99]

The use of words like "example," "represent" and "representing" in the wording of the inscription criteria reinforces the idea that World Heritage sites are exemplary or representative. In line with the Committee's early decision that established the principle of exceptionality, i.e. one site standing as a symbol for a series of similar sites,[100] a consideration

for using criterion (vi) for sites associated with recent conflicts and other negative and divisive memories could be the way in which one property stands as a representative example for a group. This guidance has remained unchanged for years and underscores a remarkable consensus for an open-ended World Heritage List comprised of a highly selective group of properties.

5.2 Dissonant histories, national narratives and memories

Counter to the objectives of UNESCO, memorialization of sites of memory can create dissonance and conflict.[101] Well-respected sociologist Charles Tilly warned that "struggles over collective memory pivot on credit and blame" and that "we had better be very careful about how we design those monuments and the stories of credit and blame they invariably tell. We can only hope that, when all is said and done, we can still tell stories about those monuments in a way that creates consensus not separation."[102]

This highlights the difficulty of memorializing sites associated with recent conflicts and other negative and divisive memories. The International Coalition of Sites of Conscience recognises this risk through the questions it raises for consideration in its Toolkit and checklist (see part 2) but, notwithstanding this, there are still examples of public memorials where the memorialization process has not been participatory and where dissonance and sometimes conflict prevail. The report of a UN panel on teaching history and memorialization noted that "post-conflict societies, whether after civil wars, dictatorships or decolonization processes, have produced parallel interpretations that have resulted in parallel realities for people, thus preventing reconciliation."[103] Furthermore, if such dissonance exists, and a State Party then moves to have such a site included on the World Heritage List, then this dissonance may erupt into disharmony and even violence. With sites associated with recent conflicts, it should be noted that dissonance may occur at the local and national level as well as the international level, with the potential to affect and seriously damage international relations.

Most States are dependent on cultural symbols including memorials as focal points "to rally the citizenry in a collective ritual of nation building and national unification."[104] The development of a state-sanctioned cultural memory is almost always dissonant, especially when it is constructed by States to support national ideologies, an official memory discourse, and even nation-building projects.[105]

It has also been said that "all new regimes must create their own myths in order to re-found the nation…through the creation of new commemorations, that is by organizing new celebration dates and building new monuments through which to express attachments to the new regime."[106] This is no better witnessed than in Rwanda with the formation of the annual day of commemoration, *International Day of Reflection on the 1994 Genocide against the Tutsi.*[107] Another example is the ESMA (*Escuela Superior de Mecanica de la Armada*) in Argentina, a former site of torture, which has been transformed by a new progressive government into a museum and is now a Site of Conscience.[108]

An example of a site that performed an act of nation building, but where dissonant memories also existed at the time of inscription is Robben Island (South Africa). It was nominated by

the African National Congress (ANC) party that was in government at the time. The narrative provided in the nomination document was about the experiences and memories of a prominent member of the ANC, Nelson Mandela. There were also prisoners from other political parties such as the Pan Africanist Congress (PAC) incarcerated at Robben Island but, although mentioned, as an opposition party their stories were not clearly told.[109] An example of a site where dissonant, international memories existed at the time of nomination is the Hiroshima Peace Memorial (Genbaku Dome) (Japan) (see 5.3.1).

5.3 Challenges in the World Heritage inscription process

Unlike the other nine criteria that assess the significance of the site itself, criterion (vi) requires three different assessments: demonstration of the outstanding universal significance of the identified association(s), assessment of the direct or tangible link with the property, and a comparative analysis with other properties with similar associations and links. The 2018 study to enhance capacity building and provide guidance for the recognition of associative values in World Heritage properties using criterion (vi) recommended that World Heritage resource manuals should be revised to provide guidance on how to apply and assess criterion (vi) and to guide the management of associations. It proposed the development of new in-depth guidance, using case studies as illustrations, to help explain how to approach associations with clear and consistent language, how to measure links with a place, and how to develop a robust comparative analysis.[110] This work, not yet carried out, would help to clarify the challenges that sites associated with recent conflicts and other negative and divisive memories face with regard to the inscription process.

5.3.1 Assessment of associative value
For sites associated with recent conflicts and other negative and divisive issues, nominations generally invoke "events" as the usual association, followed by the less frequently used "ideas." The first assessment calls on the Committee to decide whether the event or idea is of outstanding universal significance. It is important to note that in 1980, following discussion of Parent's report, the Committee decided to change the wording of criterion (vi) in the *Operational Guidelines* to eliminate the eligibility of persons and to replace "historical" significance with "universal" significance. This important change came because the Committee observed that "nominations concerning, in particular, historical events or famous people could be strongly influenced by nationalism or other particularisms in contradiction with the objectives of the World Heritage Convention."[111] It should also be noted that the term "significance" differs from "value" in OUV and has not been defined.

The challenges in determining whether an event or idea is of outstanding universal significance stem from both the specificity of sites associated with recent conflicts and the disputed nature of historical narrative. The particular circumstances of each event or idea makes it difficult to reach the threshold of universality. The narratives associated with such sites tend to be in evolution or contested, as new evidence and multiple perspectives are brought to bear on the issue.

The 1996 Committee debate on the inscription of Hiroshima Peace Memorial (Genbaku Dome) (Japan) demonstrates the contested nature of sites associated with recent conflicts and

a lack of consensus concerning significance. It demonstrates the intrinsic partiality of narratives for such sites and provides a useful example of how multiple perspectives are used to describe the same historical facts, typical of post-conflict narratives. During the 1996 session, China expressed its reservation on the grounds of differing historical perspectives:

> During the Second World War, it was the other Asian countries and peoples who suffered the greatest loss in life and property. But today there are still few people trying to deny this fact of history. As such being the case, if Hiroshima nomination is approved to be included on the World Heritage List, even though on an exceptional basis, it may be utilized for harmful purpose by these few people. This will, of course, not be conducive to the safeguarding of world peace and security.[112]

The United States of America dissociated itself from the decision due to lack of historical perspective: "Any examination of the period leading up to 1945 should be placed in the appropriate historical context." It further proposed that the inscription of war sites lies outside the scope of the World Heritage Convention and urged the Committee to address the question of the suitability of war sites for the World Heritage List.[113] This work was not carried out.

5.3.2 Evaluation of the direct and tangible link to property
The second assessment for criterion (vi) is to determine whether or not a property is directly or tangibly linked to the association. This requirement underscores the fact that the World Heritage Convention is property-based. It is not associations that are inscribed on the List but properties that are directly and tangibly linked with these associations. The Convention aims primarily to identify and protect the material evidence of physical places that convey OUV. For associations to be relevant to World Heritage, a connection must be made between the associative value and the property. In other words, it is essential to distinguish between associations that have a direct or tangible link to a place and those that do not. A direct or tangible link between the association of outstanding universal significance and the place has to be demonstrated.[114] The focus on properties explains the bracketed text in criterion (vi) which states that the Committee considers that this criterion should be preferably used in conjunction with other criteria.

5.3.3. Comparative analysis
The third assessment is the comparison of a proposed nomination with properties that have similar associations and links. Here the challenge is to select only the outstanding properties. Some associations (events, living traditions, ideas, beliefs, artistic works and literary works) with outstanding historical significance may have many properties around the world that are directly or tangibly linked to them. Given the selective nature of the World Heritage List, a proposed property must be an outstanding example of direct or tangible association.

A further challenge for sites associated with recent conflicts and other negative and divisive memories is how to conduct a meaningful comparative analysis. Is there a way to compare different examples of events that led to tragedy and loss? Is it feasible or desirable to carry out global thematic studies for sites of conflict and sites of memory?

5.3.4 Inscribing evolving values on a permanent register
As scholarship in public history and memory studies has shown, values are in continuous re-evaluation and evolution. One might question whether the World Heritage Committee is in a position to determine values at one time in a context of evolving and mutable values. Should UNESCO support one perspective by putting its official approval at a specific time on a singular version of a narrative associated with conflict? While evolving narratives might be added later to interpretation programs at the site, they could not claim to be part of World Heritage values without Committee consideration of a revised nomination. Under current practice, the World Heritage Committee runs the risk of promoting selective interpretation and excluding alternate narratives.

5.3.5 Sites inscribed under other criteria
A number of properties on the World Heritage List make no mention of human rights abuses that occurred at these sites. It is beyond the scope of this study to address the issue of sites inscribed on the World Heritage List using criteria other than (vi) that are or could be sources of dissonance because human rights abuses took place there. No systematic research has been carried out on the scope of this issue. There are World Heritage sites that have already been listed or could be proposed for future listing under criteria other than (vi) that have not or might not address negative and divisive issues related to forced labour, slavery, internment and other human rights abuses. Whether or not they are mentioned in the SOUVs or in the nomination dossiers, these issues should be part of an inclusive interpretation program and subject to an international independent academic review, as called for in the report on *Interpretation of Sites of Memory*.[115]

5.4 Inscription of multiple memories and histories

This study is concerned with sites associated with recent conflicts and other negative and divisive memories. The report of the expert meeting on this subject held in Paris in December 2019 considered "recent" to be "from the turn of the twentieth century. However, the expert meeting recognized that in some cases negative memories resulting from conflicts can endure for centuries, exceeding the general timeframe of recent."[116]

The report of the expert meeting in Paris in December 2019 identified that the term "conflicts" covers events such as "wars, battles, massacres, genocide, torture and mass violations."[117] It must be remembered however, that the events with which memories are associated must be of outstanding universal significance to meet the threshold of criterion (vi) assessment. This qualification necessarily excludes many local, regional and national conflicts of different proportions and duration.

World Wars I and II are events that would likely meet the threshold of outstanding universal significance and are a current focus of the World Heritage Committee. The existing Tentative Lists of States Parties demonstrate aspirations to inscribe sites associated with World Wars I and II. They include potential nominations from Belgium, France, Slovenia and Turkey (WWI) and France and the Russian Federation (WWII). None of these sites, alone, could be representative of the World Wars of which they were part. If these sites associated with recent conflicts are to be inscribed on the World Heritage List, a different approach to nominations,

one that works towards reconciliation and harmony, is required. One issue for inscribing sites that reflect an event such as a global conflict is that they will usually be selective and partisan, and only tell one part of a complex, transnational history.

One way to address these issues would be for a thematic study of an event, in this case each of the two World Wars, to be undertaken. Such a study would require collaboration of all the States that participated in the conflicts, including countries that, at the time, were under colonial rule of the States at war. Information from the UN Human Rights Council reports that "communities that exist outside of the dominant parties to the conflict are those that experience the most marginalization in the development of a post-conflict symbolic landscape. Identifying these groups and encouraging their participation allows their voices to be heard and to impact the development and design of the symbolic landscape in a way that is beneficial to the whole community."[118] A consensus would need to be reached on what sites best represent which typology of site. The result of this approach would be recommendations based on a robust comparative analysis and a series of properties that could best represent the site types on the broad theme of World Wars I and II.

This approach would achieve two desired outcomes. First, there would be a process of identifying the most representative sites within a clear theme and with supporting site typologies, which in turn would mitigate a flood of nominations for war-related sites. Secondly, it would be clear to the World Heritage Committee that, through key stakeholder participation, consensus among the relevant States Parties had been reached and would therefore address concerns about inscribing sites with unresolved, dissonant memories and contested narratives on the List. This work would be consistent with the report on the *Interpretation of Sites of Memory* that highlighted the importance of dialogue and mediation with stakeholders if sites had multiple histories and memories or where there may be transnational interests.[119]

5.5 Towards reconciliation

It has been said about reconciliation that "if it is to be meaningful it is not achieved in one fell swoop; it is an organic process that unfolds in daily life, within and between aggrieved communities."[120] Reconciliation is something that takes time and, in some cases, may take more than one lifetime to achieve. For example, in line with the UN Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, Canada's Truth and Reconciliation Commission Calls to Action to redress the legacy of residential schools demonstrate the enduring nature of collective memories and the lengthy period needed to advance the process of Canadian reconciliation with its Indigenous Peoples.[121]

It is state-sanctioned memories that are nominated by States Parties to the World Heritage List using criterion (vi).[122] For work towards reconciliation to be achieved at places associated with recent conflicts and other negative and divisive memories, a State Party must do the upstream work to include dissonant voices and memories within its nomination documents, the type of work identified by the International Coalition of Sites of Conscience in its Toolkit.[123] The UN Special Rapporteur in the field of cultural rights has observed that "enabling a plurality of narratives of past events was particularly crucial in post-conflict and deeply divided societies,

because it allowed insights into the experience of the other, whoever it may be, and a glimpse of people's common humanity beyond the fractured identities that are especially prominent in conflict." She concluded that such a plurality was crucial for reconciliation processes to be sustainable.[124]

It has been pointed out, however, that some dissonant memories cannot, and should not be included in the memorialization and interpretation of a site. This is the case if the dissonance is fundamentally against human rights principles. In 2007, a conference held in Chile on "Memorialization and Democracy; State Policy and Civic Action" concluded that "the desire for reconciliation and inclusion must never compromise human rights principles and that the promotion of dialogue should never degenerate into an all-pervasive relativism" and that "space existed for heterogeneous and divergent memory" but the "hard core" values (human rights values) were "not negotiable."[125] This is supported by the work of the UN Special Rapporteur in the field of cultural rights who states that "one imperative is to avoid flattening of all situations, which is conducive to denying past wrongs."[126]

The International Council of Museums has also done important work to develop guidance for dealing with difficult memories and has produced a publication specifically focused on the interpretation of contested histories.[127] Consistent with an approach to provide space for inclusive memories, the publication cites the Ulster Museum in Northern Ireland as an example of a museum that provides multiple perspectives and enables people to interpret the very recent political and civil events known as "The Troubles". The approach at this museum is to encourage transformative, rather than reflective, experiences.[128]

If a State does not include "heterogeneous and divergent memories" in its nomination document, there is a risk that sites of recent conflicts and other negative and divisive memories may contain selective and dominant narratives that support a State's ideologies and histories which may then result in the exclusion and silencing of certain groups.[129] This may, in turn, fuel underlying conflict and lead to future violence. The report of a UN panel on teaching history and memorialization noted that "most States mentioned how crucial it was to recognize the legitimacy of diverging narratives. This was to be considered as a first step towards opening up a dialogue in which all sides could express their perspective and experience of past events and have the opportunity, conversely, to listen to alternative interpretations."[130] Only if a State can work on the collective memory of a place, to develop a "consensual remembrance," a "public articulation for the past," can it hope to create social bonds and reconciliation.[131]

Considering the points outlined above, there are serious concerns about the inclusion of sites associated with recent conflicts and other negative and divisive memories on the World Heritage List. The first is related to the potential interruption, through the act of inscription, of reconciliation processes that may be underway through transitional justice mechanisms, including memorialization, and that can take considerable time to achieve. Dissonant memories and histories risk still being worked through at the time of a nomination and potential inscription.

If this is the case, then inscription by the World Heritage Committee of a singular narrative, at a moment in time, could calcify one narrative rather than allow for multiple narratives and dissonant memories to be explored and included in the Upstream Process prior to inscription, and could interfere with ongoing reconciliation processes, support agendas of exclusion and potentially re-ignite divisions among stakeholders.

While the UN, through its Human Rights Council, recognises the need for symbolic reparation and remembrance in a post-conflict/post-genocide landscape, can UNESCO's World Heritage Committee accept the materiality of these reparations on the World Heritage List? To do so, properties would have to meet the threshold of Outstanding Universal Value. In addition, the performance of transitional justice measures would need to have occurred and memorialization initiatives would need to include the voices of all the stakeholders and, therefore, represent an act of reconciliation within and between States.

A second, and related, concern has been the identification of a timeframe that should elapse before sites associated with recent conflicts and other negative and divisive memories could be eligible for consideration by the World Heritage Committee. The purpose of identifying a timeframe would be to ensure that enough time has elapsed for dissonant memories to be properly expressed through the nomination process, for reconciliation to be achieved and for universal significance to be identified. As early as 1996, heritage theorists questioned the ability to achieve a balanced assessment of sites of recent conflicts and other negative and divisive memories if undertaken within living memory.[132] Experience shows that reconciliation can take generations to achieve and, therefore, setting a timeframe for consideration of these sites may not be a useful approach.

What this may mean in the future is that sites being evaluated are no longer sites of memory but have transformed into sites of history (see 4.2), as it is unlikely that they will still be in living memory, although collective memory may still be present.

Part 6: RELATIONSHIP TO THE PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF THE WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION AND ITS *OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES*

6.1 Purpose and scope of the World Heritage Convention and its *Operational Guidelines*

In considering the relationship between the World Heritage Convention and sites associated with recent conflicts and other negative and divisive memories, four concepts are particularly relevant: universality, selectivity, education and building peace. The preamble to the Convention, reinforced by the *Operational Guidelines*, captures the essence of these ideas. The Convention focuses on cultural and natural heritage with Outstanding Universal Value, not national value. "It is incumbent on the international community as a whole to participate in the protection of the cultural and natural heritage of outstanding universal value, by the granting of collective assistance which, although not taking the place of action by the State concerned, will serve as an efficient complement thereto." It also emphasizes the selectivity of the process, "that parts of the cultural or natural heritage are of outstanding interest and therefore need to be preserved as part of the world heritage of mankind as a whole." The

Convention also points to the broad educational mandate of UNESCO, "recalling that the Constitution of the Organization provides that it will maintain, increase, and diffuse knowledge by assuring the conservation and protection of the world's heritage, and recommending to the nations concerned the necessary international conventions." Finally it points to peace building by acknowledging that destruction comes from natural and human causes, "noting that the cultural heritage and the natural heritage are increasingly threatened with destruction not only by the traditional causes of decay, but also by changing social and economic conditions which aggravate the situation with even more formidable phenomena of damage or destruction."[133]

6.1.1 Universality

Outstanding Universal Value is static and immutable, fixed by the World Heritage Committee at a specific time. By contrast, the values of sites associated with memories of recent conflicts and other negative and divisive memories are particularly changeable and continue to evolve with shifts in, and additions to, individual and collective memories and historical narratives. The values of these sites are mutable and transitory, not yet ready for inscription. They have the potential to change over time both in an understanding of past events and in a willingness of affected communities to engage in shaping the narrative. Formal designation with the World Heritage label could confirm a singular version of a narrative associated with a conflict while excluding others. Scholars warn of the danger of promoting and preserving state-sanctioned official memories that lack neutrality and favour national over universal values.

6.1.2 Selectivity

The World Heritage Convention, reinforced from the beginning by its *Operational Guidelines*, envisages a selective list of exceptional sites rather than every example of a phenomenon or typology.[134] The Committee's early discussion about the inscription of Auschwitz led it to conclude that, for sites associated with recent conflicts and other negative and divisive memories, one property could stand as an example for a group.[135] This guidance for a highly selective group of cultural and natural heritage sites has remained unchanged since it first appeared in the preamble to the Convention. The World Heritage List as of 2020 has only eighteen sites clearly identified as sites associated with recent conflicts and other negative and divisive memories and, within that, only four sites associated with recent conflicts.

The need for selectivity also supports the credibility of the World Heritage system. The many conflicts, massacres and other divisive occurrences of the twentieth and twenty-first centuries, some on a global scale, raise concerns that the World Heritage system could be overwhelmed with nominations associated with these events. This possibility would be unmanageable for both individual States and the UNESCO system. The need for selectivity points to the challenge of undertaking global research to identify the most significant events as well as the most representative sites. By developing clear typologies and selecting key components as representative symbols that stand for a theme of universal value to humanity, the World Heritage system would remain manageable and retain its credibility.

6.1.3. Education

The World Heritage Convention encourages States Parties to undertake "educational and information programs, to strengthen appreciation and respect by their peoples of the cultural

and natural heritage."[136] As a trusted institution, UNESCO promotes critical thinking, knowledge and education to a high ethical standard. Its Global Citizenship Education program addresses current concerns about human rights violations, inequality and poverty by promoting more peaceful, tolerant, inclusive, secure and sustainable societies. For World Heritage sites, educational and information programs must meet the same high ethical and scholarly standards, such as the inclusion of multiple narratives based on sound research and comparative analysis using documentary and archival sources, testimonies and material evidence. Sites associated with recent conflicts and other negative and divisive memories have the potential to teach preventive lessons and promote reconciliation and peace. Listing sites where the values are still contested means unduly favouring one narrative over others, leading to exclusion and injustice and fostering divisiveness, not peace. Such official approval by the World Heritage Committee runs the risk of promoting selective interpretation at the site and excluding alternate narratives.

6.1.4 Building peace
UNESCO's purpose is to build the defences of peace in the minds of women and men. In this regard, the World Heritage Convention specifically aims to protect and conserve the world's cultural and natural heritage by replacing destructive forces with respect and mutual understanding. For places associated with recent conflicts and other negative and divisive memories, reconciliation is a slow and painful process. Depending on the nature of the events, building peace among diverse participants and stakeholders can extend over decades and sometimes centuries. For such sites, the risk of fixing Outstanding Universal Value may arbitrarily interrupt on-going reconciliation processes and could re-ignite divisions among stakeholders. By taking sides and giving official approval to one version of a conflict, inscription of sites may have the opposite effect to the desired one, by creating barriers among people. Designation of sites with evolving and contested values puts the World Heritage Committee in the role of arbitrating among the stakeholders and interrupting the process of dialogue and reconciliation.

Part 7: CONCLUSIONS and RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions

7.1 Selective, exceptional and exemplary
From the outset, the World Heritage Convention and its *Operational Guidelines* envisaged a selective list of exceptional sites rather than many examples of a phenomenon or typology. This guidance has remained unchanged. The high threshold of OUV and the wording of inscription criteria underscore the concept that the World Heritage List is comprised of a highly selective group of properties.

In considering sites of memory, the 1979 session of the World Heritage Committee established the principle of exceptionality, i.e. of one site standing as a symbol for a series of similar sites. In dealing with subsequent proposals for inscription of sites of memory, the Committee has continued to regard them as exceptional cases, as shown by the restrictive clause for the use of criterion (vi) in successive versions of the *Operational Guidelines*. After more than forty years, as of 2020 only eighteen sites can be clearly identified as sites associated with recent conflicts and other negative and divisive memories inscribed under criterion (vi), representing 1.6 per cent of the World Heritage List, and only four of them are sites associated with recent conflicts, representing 0.4 per cent of the List (see 2.1.2).

The need for selectivity also supports the credibility of the World Heritage system. If the World Heritage List is going to meet the apparent needs of today's society, and the heritage that it seeks to preserve, and if sites of recent conflicts and other negative and divisive memories are being proposed for inscription, then these contemporary interests need to be considered through a lens of World Heritage process and policy. The many sites of conflicts, massacres and other divisive occurrences of the twentieth and twenty-first centuries, some on a global scale, that States may wish to inscribe, raise concerns that the World Heritage system could be overwhelmed with nominations associated with these events. This possibility would be unmanageable for both individual States Parties and the UNESCO system. The recommendation from the 2018 report on criterion (vi) would help respond to this situation by preparing guidance on how to develop a robust comparative analysis for sites proposed under criterion (vi). By developing clear typologies and selecting key components as representative examples that stand as exemplary symbols for a series of similar sites, the World Heritage system would remain manageable and retain its credibility.

7.2 Nationalism, divisiveness and criterion (vi)
Counter to the objectives of UNESCO, memorialization of sites of memory can maintain and create dissonance and conflict. Sites associated with recent conflicts and other negative and divisive memories are particularly vulnerable to manipulation by political parties and other interest groups with divisive agendas. As scholarly research on memorialization has shown, the development of a state-sanctioned cultural memory is almost always dissonant, especially when it is constructed by States to support national ideologies, an official memory discourse, and nation-building projects. If dissonance exists at such properties, inscription on the World Heritage List may provoke disharmony and even violence. Prior to considering the inclusion of sites associated with recent conflicts and other negative and divisive memories on the World

Heritage List, it would be important for a memorialization initiative, as outlined by the International Coalition of Sites of Conscience, to be in place in order to ensure the inclusion of memories of all stakeholders and the coming to terms with dissonant histories. Sites with unresolved and dissonant values do not meet the broader purpose of UNESCO to build the foundations of peace.

The World Heritage Committee recognized this vulnerability in 1979 when it called for careful attention to be paid to criterion (vi): "Nominations concerning, in particular, historical events or famous people could be strongly influenced by nationalism or other particularisms in contradiction with the objectives of the World Heritage Convention."[137] Constraints to the use of criterion (vi) appear in successive versions of the *Operational Guidelines*. From the six associations itemized in criterion (vi) (events, living traditions, ideas, beliefs, artistic works, literary works), "events" and "ideas" are the two associations most frequently used for sites of recent conflicts and other negative and divisive memories. Criterion (vi) is unique in requiring three separate assessments: first, an evaluation of the outstanding universal significance of the event or idea; secondly, a demonstration of a direct or tangible link between the association of outstanding universal significance and the property; and thirdly, development of a meaningful comparative analysis with a global perspective.

When inscribing sites associated with recent conflicts and other negative and divisive memories, the Committee has tended to adopt SOUVs that acknowledge specific injustices and go on to explain how such properties stand as symbols or examples of universal principles, such as liberation, advances in civil rights, anti-slavery efforts, democracy, reconciliation and peace. It is critical to recall that the purpose of the World Heritage Convention is to list *places* of Outstanding Universal Value. It is not the associated ideas that are inscribed on the World Heritage List but the physical properties with which they are directly and tangibly associated. This is why sites associated with recent conflicts and other negative and divisive memories cannot generally fit within the scope and purpose of the Convention. Ideas must be specifically associated with a physical place nominated to the List. For associations to be relevant to World Heritage, they must be of outstanding universal significance, and a connection must be made between the associations and a property. In other words, it is essential to distinguish between associations that have a direct or tangible link to a place and those that do not.

7.3 Evolving values and SOUVs
When a property is listed as a World Heritage site, the Committee adopts a Statement of Outstanding Universal Value. As scholarship in public history and memory studies has shown, values associated with sites of recent conflicts and other negative and divisive memories are not stable but continue to evolve with shifts in individual and collective memories. The values of these sites are mutable and transitory, not yet ready for inscription. They have the potential to change over time both in an understanding of past events and in a willingness of affected communities to engage in shaping the narrative. One might question whether the World Heritage Committee is in a position to determine values at a specific time in a context of evolving and mutable values. Formal designation with the World Heritage label could confirm a singular version of a narrative associated with a conflict while excluding others. While evolving narratives could be added later to interpretation programs at the site, they could not claim to be World Heritage values without consideration of a revised nomination. By

inscribing sites with evolving values at a specific time, the World Heritage Committee runs the risk of arbitrating among the stakeholders, promoting selective interpretation and excluding alternate narratives.

7.4 Public history, science-based research and ethical standards
World Heritage activities fall within the scope of public history. The designation of World Heritage sites and their interpretation programs are manifestations of public history and subject to the principles and practices of this field. History is a science and an academic discipline. Historical thinking has at its core an understanding that interpretations of the past are constantly evolving. Through an on-going process, the meanings of historical events are re-evaluated in light of new evidence as well as different perspectives and changes in society.

In line with public history standards, historical research applies established research theories and methods, and refers to existing scholarship from pertinent disciplines. When considering sites associated with recent conflicts and other negative and divisive memories, research should follow a process of critical evaluation of the historical event or idea. The work should be culturally inclusive in the sources consulted and the people involved. It should draw on primary and secondary sources in an accurate and impartial manner, reflecting the full range of voices, perspectives and experiences involved in the topic. It should demonstrate an awareness that historical narratives are written from specific worldviews and can therefore be potentially biased. The challenge for public historians is to distinguish manipulations of history for political or other ends from the legitimate continuous reinterpretation of the past.

The UN Special Rapporteur in the field of cultural rights points to the critical need for the highest ethical standards for public historians when dealing with evolving narratives and contested histories. In line with professional codes of conduct, scientific research must therefore be carried out with accuracy, objectivity, inclusiveness, impartiality, fairness and respect. A robust application of the principles and practices of public history in nomination dossiers is particularly important for sites associated with recent conflicts and other negative and divisive memories.

7.5 Peace and reconciliation
For sites associated with recent conflicts and other negative and divisive memories, reconciliation is a slow and painful process. Depending on the nature of the events, building peace among diverse participants and stakeholders can extend over decades and sometimes centuries. A roadmap for including dissonant voices and conflicting memories during memorialization initiatives has been set out in the Toolkit of the International Coalition of Sites of Conscience. Listing sites that have unresolved and contested values puts UNESCO and the Committee in the role of approving only the nominated values, excluding others and interrupting any ongoing process of dialogue and reconciliation.

The UN Special Rapporteur in the field of cultural rights notes that memorialization can begin even before a conflict is over but cautions that this timeframe does not allow "the process of reflection to come to maturity."[138] Without time for reflection and for dissonant narratives to be resolved, early inscription could promote division and further conflict.

In relation to the purpose and scope of the World Heritage Convention, and as a fundamental step towards the preparation of a nomination dossier, it would be highly advantageous for sites associated with recent conflicts and other negative and divisive memories to have implemented a memorialization initiative, to show commitment to "connect past to present, memory to action."[139] Without such an approach, sites associated with recent conflicts and other negative and divisive memories nominated to the World Heritage List could precipitate discord and violence, instead of peace and reconciliation.

Recommendations

This study concludes that sites associated with recent conflicts and other negative and divisive memories **do not normally relate to the purpose and scope of the World Heritage Convention and the broader purpose of UNESCO to build the foundations of peace.**

The use of other existing international programs, or possibly the creation of new ones, should be encouraged as alternatives to support reconciliation and raise awareness of sites associated with recent conflicts and other negative and divisive memories. Existing programs with strong potential to meet these needs may include UNESCO Memory of the World and the International Coalition of Sites of Conscience. For these sites, inclusion in the International Coalition of Sites of Conscience program could be a beneficial precursor to any World Heritage nomination.

Potential new programs could look to the model of UNESCO's Slave Route project that aims to enhance understanding of slavery in the world and to contribute to a culture of peace, by promoting reflection on inclusion, cultural pluralism, intercultural dialogue and the construction of new identities and citizenships. If associated with UNESCO, such programs would need to be compatible with existing international human rights instruments as well as the requirements for mutual respect among communities, groups and individuals.

In order to seek regional perspectives on this study, a series of regional meetings could be organized to discuss the content and application of the *Study on sites associated with recent conflicts and other negative and divisive memories.* These regional meetings would provide an opportunity for pedagogic engagement and a better understanding of the issues by wider groups of actors.

ENDNOTES

[1] Cameron and Herrmann, *Guidance*; International Coalition of Sites of Conscience, *Interpretation;* ICOMOS, *Evaluations of … Sites associated with memories.*

[2] Riegl, "Modern Cult of Monuments," 20-51.

[3] International Coalition of Sites of Conscience, *Interpretation*, 11.

[4] International Coalition of Sites of Conscience, *Interpretation*, 11.

[5] Bickford, "Memoryworks," 491-527.

[6] International Coalition of Sites of Conscience, "What is a Site of Conscience?" 1.

[7] Naidu et al., *From Memory to Action*, 7.

[8] International Coalition of Sites of Conscience, "Documenting Rohingya;" "Re-Imagining."

[9] Naidu et al., *From Memory to Action*, 7.

[10] Cameron and Herrmann, *Guidance*, 6.

[11] UNESCO, *Operational Guidelines*, par. 77 (vi).

[12] UNESCO, "Comparative study," 21, 24.

[13] UNESCO, "Comparative study," 24.

[14] UNESCO, "Comparative study," 21.

[15] UNESCO, "Report third session," par. 46.

[16] UNESCO, "Report third session," par. 35 (v).

[17] UNESCO, "Report sites associated with recent conflicts," 12.

[18] International Coalition of Sites of Conscience, *Interpretation,* 1-48.

[19] Cameron and Herrmann, *Guidance,* 1-89.

[20] ICOMOS, *Evaluations of … Sites associated with memories,* 1-25.

[21] UNESCO, "Report sites associated with recent conflicts," 22.

[22] International Centre for Transitional Justice, "What is Transitional Justice?"

[23] Naidu, "Memorialization in Post-Conflict Societies in Africa," 29.

[24] International Centre for Transitional Justice, "What is Transitional Justice?"

[25] Naidu et al., *From Memory to Action*, 11.

[26] Bickford, "Memoryworks," 491-527.

[27] United Nations General Assembly, Human Rights Council, "Report … Memorialization processes," 10.

[28] United Nations General Assembly, Human Rights Council, "Report … Memorialization processes," 11.

[29] United Nations General Assembly, Human Rights Council, "Report … Memorialization processes," 8.

[30] Naidu et al., *From Memory to Action*, 11.

[31] Naidu, "Memorialization in Post-Conflict Societies in Africa," 32.

[32] Naidu, "Memorialization in Post-Conflict Societies in Africa," 30.

[33] Naidu, "Memorialization in Post-Conflict Societies in Africa," 32.

[34] International Coalition of Sites of Conscience, "About Us."

[35] Naidu et al., *From Memory to Action*, 7.

[36] Cole, *No Legacy*, 1-25.

[37] Cole, *No Legacy*, 6.

[38] International Coalition of Sites of Conscience, *Interpretation,* 1-48.

[39] Naidu et al., *From Memory to Action*, 41.

[40] Naidu et al., *From Memory to Action*, 41.

[41] International Federation for Public History, "Bylaws."

[42] United Nations General Assembly, Human Rights Council, "Report … on writing and teaching history," 5.

[43] National Council on Public History, "NCPH Code of ethics and professional conduct."

[44] United Nations General Assembly, Human Rights Council, "Report … on writing and teaching history," 23.

[45] United Nations General Assembly, "Report … panel discussion," 4.

[46] United Nations General Assembly, Human Rights Council, "Report … Memorialization processes," 5.

[47] United Nations General Assembly, Human Rights Council, "Report … Memorialization processes," 5.

[48] Huyssen, *Present Pasts,* 90.

[49] United Nations General Assembly, Human Rights Council, "Report … Memorialization processes," 8.

[50] Bickford, "Memoryworks," 499.

[51] Bickford, "Memoryworks," 491.

[52] Brett et al., *Memorialization,* 1-44.

[53] Naidu, "Memorialization in Post-Conflict Societies in Africa," 36.

[54] Bickford, "Memoryworks," 491.

[55] Naidu, "Memorialization in Post-Conflict Societies in Africa," 32.

[56] Huyssen, *Present Pasts*, 18.

[57] Huyssen, *Present Pasts*, 18.

[58] Foote, *Shadowed Ground*; Foote et al., "Hungary after 1989," 305.

[59] Cohn and Teri, "Race, Gender," 211-29.

[60] United Nations General Assembly, Human Rights Council, "Report … Memorialization processes," 21.

[61] Bickford, "Memoryworks," 491-527.

[62] Ashplant et al., *Politics of War,* 3-86.

[63] United Nations General Assembly, Human Rights Council, "Report … Memorialization processes," 5.

[64] Naidu, "Memorialization in Post-Conflict Societies in Africa," 32.

[65] Abrão and Diène, "Foreword," 15.

[66] United Nations General Assembly, Human Rights Council, "Report … Memorialization processes," 6.

[67] United Nations General Assembly, Human Rights Council, "Report … Memorialization processes," 6.

[68] Naidu et al., *From Memory to Action,* 1-42.

[69] Naidu et al., *From Memory to Action,* 12.

[70] United Nations General Assembly, Human Rights Council, "Report … Memorialization processes,"13.

[71] United Nations General Assembly, Human Rights Council, "Information … Northern Ireland," 19.

[72] Naidu et al., *From Memory to Action,* 29-31.

[73] United Nations General Assembly, Human Rights Council, "Information … Northern Ireland," 18.

[74] United Nations General Assembly, "Report … panel discussion," par. 36.

[75] United Nations General Assembly, Human Rights Council, "Report … Memorialization processes," 13.

[76] Nora, "Between Memory," 19.

[77] Nora, "Between Memory," 12.

[78] Nora, "Between Memory," 20.

[79] Ashplant et al., *Politics of War,* 3-86.

[80] Chivallon, "Bristol," 350.

[81] Chivallon, "Bristol," 350.

[82] Chivallon, "Bristol," 356.

[83] Cohn and Teri, "Race, Gender," 211-29.

[84] Cohn and Teri, "Race, Gender," 211-29.

[85] Lowenthal, *The Past*, 6.

[86] Viejo-Rose, "Memorial Functions," 466.

[87] Bickford and Sodaro, "Remembering Yesterday," 70.

[88] https://fr.wikipedia.org/wiki/Monument_aux_morts_de_la_guerre_de_1870_en_France; https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/Category:Bertoldsbrunnen,_St._Peter_(Hochschwarzwald)

[89] https://historicengland.org.uk/services-skills/education/educational-images/maiwand-war-memorial-forbury-gardens-5361

[90] Bickford and Sodaro, "Remembering Yesterday," 76.

[91] Bickford, "Memoryworks," 504.

[92] Irwin-Zarecka, *Frames of Remembrance,* 67.

[93] UNESCO, "Comparative study," 24.

[94] UNESCO, *Constitution*, preamble.

[95] UNESCO, *Convention World Heritage*, preamble.

[96] UNESCO, *Convention World Heritage*, art. 11.2.

[97] UNESCO, *Operational Guidelines*, par. 49.

[98] Cameron and Rössler, *Many Voices*, 28.

[99] UNESCO, *Operational Guidelines*, par. 52.

[100] UNESCO, "Report third session," par. 46.

[101] Bickford, "Memoryworks," 491-527.

[102] Tilly, *Credit and Blame*, quoted in Bickford, "Memoryworks," 498.

[103] United Nations General Assembly, "Report … panel discussion," 4.

[104] Leong, "Culture," 357.

[105] Tunbridge and Ashworth, *Dissonant Heritage*, 109.

[106] Fernandez and Humlebaek, "Collective Memory," 144.

[107] UNESCO, "UNESCO commemorates."

[108] Brett et al., *Memorialization,* 1-44.

[109] Beazley, "Drawing a line," 263.

[110] Cameron and Herrmann, *Guidance*, par. 44.3.

[111] UNESCO, "Report third session," par. 35.

[112] UNESCO, "Report twentieth session," annex V.

[113] UNESCO, "Report twentieth session," annex V.

[114] Cameron and Herrmann, *Guidance*, par. 19.

[115] International Coalition of Sites of Conscience, *Interpretation,* 28-9.

[116] UNESCO, "Report sites associated with recent conflicts," par. 12.

[117] UNESCO, "Report sites associated with recent conflicts," par. 12.

[118] United Nations General Assembly, Human Rights Council, "Information … Northern Ireland," 22.

[119] International Coalition of Sites of Conscience, *Interpretation,* 24.

[120] Lehrer, "Can there be," 272.

[121] United Nations General Assembly, "Declaration;" Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada, "Calls to Action" and "Honouring the Truth."

[122] Beazley, "Politics," 60.

[123] Naidu et al., *From Memory to Action,* 1-42.

[124] United Nations General Assembly, "Report … panel discussion," 4.

[125] Brett et al., *Memorialization,* 9.

[126] United Nations General Assembly, Human Rights Council, "Report … Memorialization processes," 13

[127] ICOM, "Difficult Issues;" ICOM, "Special Issue: Museums and Contested Histories."

[128] Logan, "Collecting the Troubles," 176.

[129] Beazley, "Politics," 59.

[130] United Nations General Assembly, "Report … panel discussion," 9.

[131] Irwin-Zarecka, *Frames of Remembrance,* 67, 69.

[132] Tunbridge and Ashworth, *Dissonant Heritage*, 109.

[133] UNESCO, *Convention World Heritage*, preamble.

[134] Cameron and Rössler, *Many Voices*, 28.

[135] UNESCO, "Report third session," par. 46.

[136] UNESCO, *Convention World Heritage*, art. 27.

[137] UNESCO, "Comparative study," 21.

[138] United Nations General Assembly, Human Rights Council, "Report … Memorialization processes," 13.

[139] International Coalition of Sites of Conscience, "About Us."

Appendix A

**DECISIONS FROM 42nd SESSION OF WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE
(MANAMA, 2018)**

Decision **42 COM 5A** (Manama, 2018), paragraph 7:
7. Noting the discussion paper by ICOMOS on Evaluations of World Heritage
Nominations related to Sites Associated with Memories of Recent Conflicts, decides to
convene an Expert Meeting on sites associated with memories of recent conflicts to allow
for both philosophical and practical reflections on the nature of memorialization, the value
of evolving memories, the inter-relationship between material and immaterial attributes in
relation to memory, and the issue of stakeholder consultation; and to develop guidance on
whether and how these sites might relate to the purpose and scope of the *World Heritage
Convention*, provided that extra-budgetary funding is available and invites the States
Parties to contribute financially to this end.

Decision **42 COM 8B.24** (Manama, 2018):
The World Heritage Committee,
1. Having examined Documents WHC/18/42.COM/8B and WHC/18/42.COM/INF.8B1,
2. Recalling the reservations it has expressed concerning the inscription of sites related to
negative memories,
3. Recognizes that the evaluation undertaken by ICOMOS may be considered effective
until its 45th session in 2021;
4. Decides to adjourn consideration of the nomination of the **Funerary and Memorial
sites of the First World War (Western Front)**, **Belgium** and **France,** until a
comprehensive reflection has taken place and the Committee at its 44th session has
discussed and decided whether and how sites associated with recent conflicts and other
negative and divisive memories might relate to the purpose and scope of the *World
Heritage Convention* and its *Operational Guidelines*;
5. Encourages States Parties to provide support to the undertaking of the comprehensive
reflection, including through contributions or hosting an expert meeting;
6. Notes that the nomination of the **Funerary and Memorial sites of the First World
War (Western Front), Belgium** and **France**, could only be considered by the Committee
upon further review by the Advisory Bodies in light of Committee decision referred to
above and upon receipt of additional information to be provided by the States Parties
concerned.

Decision **42 COM 8** (Manama, 2018), paragraph 4:
4. Also decides that the evaluation of "sites associated with recent conflicts" shall be
undertaken once a comprehensive reflection has taken place and the Committee at its 44th
session has discussed and decided how these sites might relate to the purpose and scope of
the *World Heritage Convention* and its *Operational Guidelines*.

https://whc.unesco.org/archive/2018/whc18-42com-18-en.pdf

Appendix B

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abrão, Paulo and Doudou Diène. "Foreword." In *Strengthening Memory, Justice and Human Rights in Brazil and the Southern Hemisphere*, edited by Gabriel Bix, 11-16. Brasilia: Brazilian Amnesty Commission, Ministry of Justice; New York: International Coalition of Sites of Conscience, 2015.

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism.* London New York: Verso, 1991.

Arrhenius, Thordis. "The Cult of Age in Mass-Society: Alois Riegl's Theory of Conservation." *Future anterior: journal of historic preservation - history, theory & criticism* 1, no 1 (2004): 75-81.

Ashplant, T.G., Graham Dawson and Michael Roper. *The Politics of War Memory and Commemoration.* London: Routledge, 2000.

Auchter, Jessica. "Theorizing haunting and the international after genocide: the cases of Rwanda and Darfur." *Ethnicity Studies* 2 (2015): 36-56.

Avrami, Erica, Susan Macdonald, Randall Mason and David Myers, eds. *Values in Heritage Management: Emerging Approaches and Research Directions.* Los Angeles: The Getty Conservation Institute, 2019.

Beazley, Olwen. "Drawing a line around a shadow? Including associative, intangible cultural heritage values on the World Heritage List." PhD thesis, Australian National University, 2006.

Beazley, Olwen. "Politics and Power: The Hiroshima Peace Memorial (Genbaku Dome) as World Heritage." In *Heritage and Globalization*, edited by Sophia Labadi and Colin Long, 45-65. Abingdon and New York: Routledge, 2010.

Bickford, Louis. "Memoryworks/Memory Works." In *Transitional Justice, Culture, and Society: Beyond Outreach,* edited by Clara Ramírez-Barat, 491-527. New York: Social Science Research Council, 2014. https://www.ictj.org/publication/transitional-justice-culture-and-society-beyond-outreach

Bickford, Louis, and Amy Sodaro. "Remembering Yesterday to Protect Tomorrow: The Internationalization of a New Commemorative Paradigm." In *Memory and the Future: Transnational Politics, Ethics and Society*, edited by Yifat Gutman, Adam Brown and Amy Sodaro, 66-86. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.

Brett, Sebastian, Louis Bickford, Liz Ševčenko and Marcella Rios. *Memorialization and Democracy: State Policy and Civic Action.* Santiago: n.p., 2007. https://www.ictj.org/sites/default/files/ICTJ-Global-Memorialization-Democracy-2007-English_0.pdf

Cameron, Christina. "World Heritage Sites of Conscience and Memory." *World Heritage and Cultural Diversity*, edited by Dieter Offenhäuser, Walther Zimmerli and Marie-Theres Albert, 112-19. Cottbus: German Commission for UNESCO, 2010.

Cameron, Christina and Judith Herrmann. *Guidance and capacity building for the recognition of associative values using World Heritage criterion (vi).* Paris: UNESCO, 2018. https://whc.unesco.org/en/nominations/

Cameron, Christina and Mechtild Rössler. *Many Voices, One Vision: The Early Years of the World Heritage Convention*. Farnham: Ashgate, 2013 (now London: Routledge, 2017).

Chivallon, Christine. "Bristol and the Eruption of Memory: Making the Slave-Trading Past Visible." *Social & Cultural Geography* 2, no. 3 (2001): 347-63.

Cohn, Bernard S. and Silvio Teri. "Race, Gender and Historical Narrative in the Reconstruction of a Nation: Remembering and Forgetting the American Civil War." In *From the Margins: Historical Anthropology and its Futures*, edited by Brian Leith Axel, 211-29. Durham: Duke University Press, 2002.

Cole, Elizabeth A. *No Legacy for Transitional Justice Efforts without Education, Education as an Outreach Partner for Transitional Justice*. [s.l.]: International Centre for Transitional Justice, 2017. https://www.ictj.org/sites/default/files/Transitional_Justice_Legacy_Education.pdf

Dawson, Graham. "Trauma, Place and the Politics of Memory: Bloody Sunday, Derry, 1972-2004." *History Workshop Journal* 59, no. 1 (spring 2005): 151-78. https://doi.org/10.1093/hwj/dbi013

Edkins, Jenny. *Trauma and the Memory of Politics.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Fernandez, Paloma Aguilar and Carsten Humlebaek. "Collective Memory and National Identity in the Spanish Democracy: The Legacies of Francoism and the Civil War." *History and Memory* 14, nos. 1 and 2 (2002), 121-64.

Foote, Kenneth E. *Shadowed Ground, America's Landscapes of Violence and Tragedy*. Austin: University of Texas, 1997.

Foote, Kenneth E., Attila Toth and Anett Arvay. "Hungary after 1989: Inscribing a New Past on Place." *Geographical Review* 90, no. 3 (2000): 301-35.

Huyssen, Andreas. *Present Pasts: Urban Palimpsests and the Politics of Memory*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2003.

ICOM. "Difficult Issues: ICOM International Conference 21-23 September 2017, Helsingborg, Sweden." Accessed 8 April 2020. http://www.icom-helsingborg-2017.org/conference/

ICOM. "Special Issue: Museums and Contested Histories." *Museum* 70, nos. 3-4 (2018): 1-145.

ICOMOS. *Evaluations of World Heritage Nominations related to Sites Associated with Memories of Recent Conflicts*. Paris: ICOMOS, 2018. https://whc.unesco.org/en/nominations/

ICOMOS. *Nara Document on Authenticity*. Paris: ICOMOS, 1994. https://www.icomos.org/charters/nara-e.pdf

ICOMOS. *The World Heritage List, What is OUV? Defining the Outstanding Universal Value of Cultural World Heritage Properties*. Compiled by Jukka Jokilehto, with contributions from Christina Cameron, Michel Parent and Michael Petzet. Monuments and Sites XVI. Berlin: Hendrik Bäßler Verlag, 2008.

International Centre for Transitional Justice. "What is Transitional Justice?" Accessed 8 February 2020. https://www.ictj.org/about/transitional-justice

International Coalition of Sites of Conscience. "About Us." Accessed 8 February 2020. https://www.sitesofconscience.org/en/who-we-are/about-us/

International Coalition of Sites of Conscience. "Documenting Human Rights Violations with Rohingya Communities." Accessed 3 April 2020. https://www.sitesofconscience.org/en/2019/12/documenting-human-rights-violations-with-rohingya-communities/

International Coalition of Sites of Conscience. *Interpretation of Sites of Memory*. Paris: World Heritage Centre, 2018. https://whc.unesco.org/en/nominations/

International Coalition of Sites of Conscience. "Re-Imagining a Peaceful Future in South Sudan." Accessed 3 April 2020. https://www.sitesofconscience.org/en/2016/06/re-imagining-a-peaceful-future-in-south-sudan/

International Coalition of Sites of Conscience. "Understanding and Addressing Violations of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights in Transitional Justice." Accessed 16 April 2020. https://www.sitesofconscience.org/en/2020/03/understanding-and-addressing-violations-of-economic-social-and-cultural-rights-in-transitional-justice-an-assessment-tool/

International Coalition of Sites of Conscience. "What is a Site of Conscience?" Accessed 16 April 2020. https://www.sitesofconscience.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/07/Press-Kit_2019.pdf

International Federation for Public History. "Bylaws revised September 2016." Accessed 2 April 2020. https://ifph.hypotheses.org/sample-page/ifph-bylaws-fihp-statuts

Irwin-Zarecka, Iwona. *Frames of Remembrance: The Dynamics of Collective Memory*. New Brunswick and London: Transaction Publishers, 2007.

Lehrer, Erica. "Can there be a conciliatory heritage*?" International Journal of Heritage Studies* 16, nos. 4-5 (July-September 2010): 269-88.

Leong, Wai-Teng. "Culture and the State: Manufacturing Traditions for Tourism." *Critical Studies in Mass Communication* 6 (1989): 355-75.

Logan, Karen. "Collecting the Troubles and Beyond: The role of the Ulster Museum in interpreting contested history." Accessed 8 April 2020. https://books.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/arthistoricum/reader/download/428/428-17-84269-1-10-20190314.pdf

Longman, Timothy. "The Uses and Abuses of Media; Rwanda before and after the Genocide." In *Transitional Justice, Culture, and Society: Beyond Outreach,* edited by Clara Ramírez-Barat, 447-78. New York: Social Science Research Council, 2014.

Lowenthal, David. *The Past is a Foreign Country*. Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press, 1985.

Moore, Lisa M. "(Re)covering the Past, Remembering Trauma: The Politics of Commemoration at Sites of Atrocity." *Journal of Public and International Affairs* 3 (2009): 47-63. https://jpia.princeton.edu/sites/jpia/files/2009-3.pdf

Naidu, Ereshnee. "Memorialisation in Post-Conflict Societies in Africa: Potentials and Challenges." In *Memorials in Times of Transition*, edited by Susanne Buckley-Zistel and Stefanie Schäfer, 29-46. Cambridge: Intersentia, 2014.

Naidu, Ereshnee. "Memorialisation in Post-Conflict Societies in Africa: Potentials and Challenges." In *Strengthening Memory, Justice and Human Rights in Brazil and the Southern Hemisphere*, edited by Gabriel Bix, 27-40. Brasilia: Brazilian Amnesty Commission, Ministry of Justice; New York: International Coalition of Sites of Conscience, 2015.

Naidu, Ereshnee, Bix Gabriel, and Mofidul Hoque, International Coalition of Sites of Conscience. *From Memory to Action: a Toolkit for Memorialization in Post-Conflict Societies,* 2nd ed. [s.l.]: Amnesty Commission, Governo Federal Brasil, Ministry of Justice, n.d. https://forum.savingplaces.org/HigherLogic/System/DownloadDocumentFile.ashx?DocumentFileKey=a9c268c5-365a-aeaf-7e62-b848dd893eca&forceDialog=0

National Council on Public History. "How Historians Work." Accessed 23 February 2020. https://ncph.org/what-is-public-history/how-historians-work/

National Council on Public History. "NCPH Code of ethics and professional conduct." Accessed 23 February 2020. https://ncph.org/about/governance-committees/code-of-ethics-and-professional-conduct/

Nora, Pierre. "Between Memory and History: Les Lieux de Mémoire." *Représentations* 26 (1989): 7-24.

Ricoeur, Paul. *Memory, History and Forgetting*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2009.

Ricoeur, Paul. "Vulnérabilité de la mémoire." In *Patrimoine et passions identitaires*, edited by Jacques Le Goff, 17-31. Paris: Fayard, 1998.

Riegl, Alois. "The Modern Cult of Monuments: Its Character and Development." *Oppositions 25,* translated and edited by Kurt Forster, 20-51. New York: Rizzoli, 1982.

Robin, Simon ed. *Pathways of Innovation: Civil Society Advancing Transitional Justice.* New York: International Coalition of Sites of Conscience, 2020. https://www.sitesofconscience.org/en/2020/03/pathways-of-innovation-civil-society-advancing-transitional-justice/

Silkes, Elizabeth. "Cultural Heritage Reminds Us of Our Shared Humanity. That's Why Threats Against Them are So Dangerous." *Time*, 10 January 2020. https://time.com/author/elizabeth-silkes/

Tilly, Charles. *Credit and Blame*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008. Quoted in Louis Bickford. "Memoryworks/Memory Works." In *Transitional Justice, Culture, and Society: Beyond Outreach,* edited by Clara Ramírez-Barat, 498. New York: Social Science Research Council, 2014.

Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada. "Calls to Action." Winnipeg, 2015. Accessed 16 April 2020. http://www.trc.ca/

Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada. "Honouring the Truth, Reconciling for the Future." Winnipeg, 2015. Accessed 16 April 2020. http://www.trc.ca/

Tunbridge, J.E. and G.J. Ashworth. *Dissonant Heritage: The Management of the Past as a Resource in Conflict*. Chichester: John Wiley and sons, 1995.

UNESCO. "Comparative study of nominations and criteria for world cultural heritage, principles and criteria for inclusion of properties on the World Heritage List by Michel Parent," Paris, 11 October 1979, CC-79/conf.003/11 annex. http://whc.unesco.org/archive/1979/cc-79-conf003-11e.pdf

UNESCO. *Constitution of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization*. London: UNESCO, 1945. http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php-URL_ID=15244&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html

UNESCO. *Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage*. Paris: UNESCO, 1972. http://whc.unesco.org/en/conventiontext/

UNESCO. *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention.* Paris: UNESCO, 2019. https://whc.unesco.org/en/guidelines/

UNESCO, "Report of the expert meeting on sites associated with recent conflicts and other negative and divisive memories," Paris, 4-6 December 2019.

UNESCO, "Report of the rapporteur on the third session of the World Heritage Committee in Cairo and Luxor, 22-26 October 1979," Paris, 30 November 1979, CC-79/conf.003/13. http://whc.unesco.org/archive/1979/cc-79-conf003-13e.pdf

UNESCO, "Report of the rapporteur on the twentieth session of the World Heritage Committee in Merida, 2-7 December 1996," Paris, 10 March 1997, WHC-96/CONF.201/21. https://whc.unesco.org/archive/1996/whc-96-conf201-21e.pdf

UNESCO, Report of the International World Heritage Expert Meeting on Criterion (vi) and associative values (Warsaw, Poland, 28-30 March 2012)." Accessed 10 February 2020. http://whc.unesco.org/en/events/827/

UNESCO. "UNESCO commemorates the International Day of Reflection on the 1994 Genocide against the Tutsi." Accessed February 10, 2020. https://en.unesco.org/news/unesco-commemorates-international-day-reflection-1994-genocide-against-tutsi

United Nations General Assembly. "Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples." New York, 13 September 2007. Accessed 16 April 2020. https://www.un.org/development/desa/indigenouspeoples/declaration-on-the-rights-of-indigenous-peoples.html

United Nations General Assembly. "Report of the United Nations Commissioner for Human Rights, Summary of panel discussion on history teaching and memorialization processes." Geneva, 22 December 2014, A/HRC/28/36, par. 11. Accessed 23 February 2020. http://www.concernedhistorians.org/content_files/file/TO/343.pdf

United Nations General Assembly, Human Rights Council. "Information presented by the Northern Ireland Human Rights Commission on the Derry/Londonderry Report on Upholding the Human Right to Culture in Post-Conflict Societies." Geneva, 27 February 2014, A/HRC/25/NI/5. Accessed 5 April 2020. https://ap.ohchr.org/documents/dpage_e.aspx?si=A/HRC/25/NI/5

United Nations General Assembly, Human Rights Council. "Report of the Special Rapporteur in the field of cultural rights on writing and teaching history." Geneva, 9 August 2013, A/68/296. Accessed 23 February 2020. https://documents-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N13/422/91/PDF/N1342291.pdf?OpenElement

United Nations General Assembly, Human Rights Council. "Report of the Special Rapporteur in the field of cultural rights, Farida Shaheed: Memorialization processes." Geneva, 23 January 2014, A/HRC/25/49. Accessed 10 January 2020. https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/766862

Viejo-Rose, Dacia. "Memorial Functions: Intent, impact and the right to remember." *Memory Studies* 4, no. 4 (2011): 465-80.

Wagoner, Brady and Ignacio Bresco. "Conflict and Memory: The Past in the Present." *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology* 22, no 1 (2016): 3– 4.

Appendix C

Expert meeting
on sites associated with recent conflicts
and other negative and divisive memories

4-6 December 2019
UNESCO IIEP, Paris, France
ROOM II

REPORT

State of
Kuwait

Ministry of
Foreign Affairs
Republic of
Korea

BACKGROUND

1. In view of the increasing number of nominations submitted or under preparation related to sites associated with memories of recent conflicts, the World Heritage Committee at its 42nd session (Manama, 2018) in three of its decisions requested to convene an Expert Meeting on sites associated with memories of recent conflicts. These decisions are presented in chronological order here below.

2. In its Decision **42 COM 5A** (Manama, 2018), the World Heritage Committee, noting the discussion paper by ICOMOS on Evaluations of World Heritage Nominations related to Sites Associated with Memories of Recent Conflicts, decided to convene an Expert Meeting on sites associated with memories of recent conflicts to allow for both philosophical and practical reflections on the nature of memorialization, the value of evolving memories, the inter-relationship between material and immaterial attributes in relation to memory, and the issue of stakeholder consultation; and to develop guidance on whether and how these sites might relate to the purpose and scope of the World Heritage Convention, provided that extra-budgetary funding is available and invited the States Parties to contribute financially to this end.

3. In its Decision **42 COM 8B.24** (Manama, 2018), while recalling the reservations it has expressed concerning the inscription of sites related to negative memories, the Committee decided to adjourn consideration of the nomination of the Funerary and Memorial sites of the First World War (Western Front), Belgium and France, until a comprehensive reflection has taken place and the Committee at its 44th session (Fuzhou, China, 29 June to 9 July 2020) has discussed and decided whether and how sites associated with recent conflicts and other negative and divisive memories might relate to the purpose and scope of the World Heritage Convention and its Operational Guidelines. In the same decision the Committee noted that the nomination of the Funerary and Memorial sites of the First World War (Western Front), could only be considered by the Committee upon further review by the Advisory Bodies in light of Committee decision referred to above and upon receipt of additional information to be provided by the States Parties concerned.

4. Finally, in its Decision **42 COM 8** (Manama, 2018), the Committee also decided that the evaluation of "sites associated with recent conflicts" shall be undertaken once a comprehensive reflection has taken place and once the Committee at its 44th session has discussed and decided how these sites might relate to the purpose and scope of the World Heritage Convention and its Operational Guidelines.

EXPERT MEETING

5. The meeting was held in Paris from 4 to 6 December 2019 (see Agenda of the Meeting in Annex I) and was organized by the UNESCO World Heritage Centre thanks to the financial support of the governments of Australia, France, Kuwait, Republic of Korea and UNESCO, as well as in-kind support from the African World Heritage Fund.

6. The meeting brought together 29 experts from different constituencies and backgrounds from all regions of the world, including representatives of the Advisory Bodies, UNESCO Category 2 Centres, World Heritage Centre as well as the Communication and Information Sector, Education Sector and Science Sector of UNESCO (List of participants in Annex II).

7. Ms Isabelle Longuet (France) was chosen as Chairperson of the meeting and Ms Eugene Jo (ICCROM), as Rapporteur.

8. In preparation of the meeting, the World Heritage Centre (WHC) had shared a number of relevant documents including the text of the 1972 Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage, the 2019 Operational Guidelines, the full text of Decisions **42 COM 5A**, **42 COM 8** and **42 COM 8B.24**, the Report of the International World Heritage Expert Meeting on Criterion (vi) and associative values (Warsaw, Poland, 2012), the Wannsee Memorandum (Berlin, 2017), "What is OUV? Defining the Outstanding Universal Value of Cultural World Heritage Properties" (ICOMOS Study, 2008), Evaluation of World Heritage Nominations related to Sites Associated with Memories of Recent Conflicts (ICOMOS Paper, 2018), Guidance and Capacity Building for the Recognition of Associative Values using World Heritage Criterion (vi) (2018) and the Study on the Interpretation of sites of memory (2018).

9. The meeting benefitted from the presentations of two ongoing studies, the Scoping Study on sites associated with recent conflicts, and the ICOMOS study on Sites associated with Memories of recent conflicts: whether and how these might relate to the purpose and scope of the World Heritage Convention and its Operational Guidelines.

OUTCOME

10. In response to the trend indicating that a significant number of sites on Tentative Lists, many of which might be submitted as World Heritage nominations in the near future related to sites associated with memories of recent conflicts, and in the absence of clear parameters/frameworks for how such sites might relate to the World Heritage Convention, the Expert Meeting allowed, through a representative panel of 29 experts from all regions, to discuss in-depth the issues raised by the World Heritage Committee at its 42nd session.

11. In particular, the Expert Meeting focused its discussion on whether and how sites associated with recent conflicts and other negative and divisive memories might relate to the purpose and scope of the World Heritage Convention and its Operational Guidelines. The full complexity of the issues was thoroughly discussed within the meeting.

12. The experts considered that, in the context of this expert meeting, the term "*conflict*" is considered to cover events such as wars, battles, massacres, genocide, torture and mass violations. The term "*recent*" is considered to be from the turn of the twentieth century. However, the expert meeting recognized that in some cases negative memories resulting from conflicts can endure for centuries, exceeding the general timeframe of recent.

13. Past decisions and reflections relating to the issue of sites associated with conflict were recalled. While the experts recognize that there are a few exceptional cases where such sites were inscribed especially in the early years of the Convention, they noted the need to understand them in the context of the following decisions and reflections. From the earliest days of the Convention, the Committee has had concerns over the inscription of Sites of Memory.

    - In 1979, ICOMOS advised the Committee:
    In any case, we would favour an extremely selective approach towards places like "famous battlefields", where there are no architectural features of note within the area in question. …… sites representing the positive and negative sides of human history will only be invested with real force if we make the most remarkable into unique symbols, each one standing for the whole series of similar events. (CC-79/CONF.OO3/11)

    - Following this advice, the Committee decided, when inscribing Auschwitz:
    to enter Auschwitz concentration camp on the List as a unique site and to restrict the inscription of other sites of a similar nature;

    Particular attention should be given to cases which fall under criterion (vi) so that the net result would not be a reduction in the value of the List, due to the large potential number of nominations as well as to political difficulties. Nominations concerning, in particular, historical events or famous people could be strongly influenced by nationalism or other particularisms in contradiction with the objectives of the World Heritage Convention. (CC-79/CONF.003/13)

14. In dealing with subsequent proposals for inscription of Sites of Memory, the Committee has continued to show great caution and to regard such sites as exceptional cases, in line

with the constraints placed on the use of criterion (vi) in successive versions of the Operational Guidelines.

15. The meeting took account of the purposes of the World Heritage Convention and its reference to the Constitution of UNESCO (Preamble). The Convention must answer to UNESCO's general mission of promoting peace and cooperation, and measures have been taken to align its objectives, as was seen in the adoption by the World Heritage Committee and the General Assembly of States Parties of the *Policy for the Integration of a Sustainable Development Perspective into the processes of the World Heritage Convention (2015).* Following on from this, the Operational Guidelines have been amended in 2019 to include guidance on incorporating into the implementation of the Convention sustainable development principles, a respect for diversity, equity, gender equality and human rights and the use of inclusive and participatory planning and stakeholder consultation processes (e.g. paragraphs 111b, 119 of the Operational Guidelines). The justification for inscription of sites associated with recent conflicts and other negative and divisive memories must be in line with the spirit of the World Heritage Convention.

16. The meeting acknowledged the range of risks involved in inscribing sites associated with memories of recent conflicts. The risk of fixing Outstanding Universal Value might interfere with on-going reconciliation processes and could re-ignite divisions between stakeholders. There is also risk that UNESCO could be seen as the arbitrator in deciding a singular version of a narrative associated with a conflict, whilst inscription could encourage a hierarchy of victims and create barriers between people. It also runs the risk of promoting selective interpretation, manipulation of messages and exclusion of alternate narratives.

17. The experts discussed ethical considerations in dealing with sites associated with memories of recent conflicts. Ethical considerations include honesty, integrity, fairness and respect. The danger of inscribing such sites on the World Heritage List is that the interpretation of these sites is particularly vulnerable to being manipulated by political parties and instrumentalized by interest groups with divisive agendas.

18. The experts discussed practical difficulties in accommodating sites associated with memories of recent conflicts to the World Heritage Convention. Aligning sites which have evolving values with the idea of immutable Outstanding Universal Value is problematic, in terms of identifying one fixed value in sites that may have multiple, evolving or contested values associated with multiple stakeholders. It is also difficult to determine how sites associated with memories of recent conflicts might justify the inscription criteria as currently worded. Ensuring authentic, broad consultation of stakeholders is difficult, if not impossible. It is also problematic to compare the relative value of memories or the relative value of conflicts.

19. The meeting benefited from presentations of different programmes related to recognizing memories associated with recent conflicts. The experts recognized that for

documentary heritage of some memory places, the UNESCO Programme Memory of the World would be suitable, and for many sites the network of the International Coalition of Sites of Conscience might be appropriate. They also considered that regional programmes such as the European Heritage Label and potential programmes in other regions may also be a future option. They further considered that educational programmes as identified in the Wannsee Memorandum would be beneficial for all memory sites. ICOM Germany and ICOM Nord Conference on Difficult Issues (September 2017) and the ICOM Code of Ethics for Museums (1986, revised in 2004) were also considered as important references on advancing these considerations.

20. The experts also recalled the remaining work that has to be carried out regarding the use of criterion (vi) as was outlined in the recent study conducted in 2018. They recommended new in-depth guidance using case studies as illustrations to help explain how to approach associations (events, living traditions, ideas, beliefs, artistic works, literary works) with clear and consistent language, how to measure links with a place, and how to develop a robust comparative analysis. This work remains to be carried out.

21. It was also concluded that further studies and research would be needed, within the scope of the World Heritage Convention, on associations in general as well as on the subject matter of sites associated with recent conflicts and negative and divisive memories and peace, inclusive narratives, educational values, interpretation and healing and reconciliation.

RECOMMENDATIONS

22. With regard to sites associated with recent conflicts and other negative and divisive memories, the experts consider that such properties do not relate to the purpose and scope of the World Heritage Convention and its Operational Guidelines, although there are properties that were previously inscribed on an exceptional basis, especially in the early years of the Convention.

23. The experts recommend to the States Parties to consider other instruments and programmes as mentioned in paragraph 19 (of the present document), notably, for documentary heritage of some memory places, the UNESCO Programme Memory of the World, the network of the International Coalition of Sites of Conscience, the regional programmes such as the European Heritage Label and potential programmes in other regions as well as educational programmes as identified in the Wannsee Memorandum. The ICOM Germany and ICOM Nord Conference on Difficult Issues and the ICOM Code of Ethics for Museums should also be considered as important references.

**Expert meeting on sites associated with recent conflicts
and other negative and divisive memories**

**4-6 December 2019
UNESCO-IIPE (Paris)**

Agenda

WEDNESDAY 4 DECEMBER 2019

09.30 – 10.00 **Registration – Entrance at 7-9, rue Eugène Delacroix, 75116 Paris**
Welcome coffee offered to participants (2nd floor)

10.00 – 10.20 **Welcome and opening remarks**
Mechtild Rössler, Director, UNESCO World Heritage Centre

10.20 – 10.30 **Election of Chairperson and Rapporteur of the Meeting**

10.30 – 12.50 **FIRST SESSION | Background to the Meeting, Decisions of the World Heritage Committee and Related Studies**

Mechtild Rössler, Director, UNESCO World Heritage Centre and **Alessandro Balsamo** Chief of Nominations Desk, UNESCO World Heritage Centre: Sites of Memory, UNESCO's approaches (30 min)

Christina Cameron and **Olwen Beazley**: Exploring the issues concerning the just-initiated study on sites associated with recent conflicts (30 min)

Jean Louis Luxen and **Christopher Young**: Interpretation of Sites of Memory - (20 min)

Fackson Banda, UNESCO/Communication and Information Sector: Brief overview of the Memory of the World Programme (10 min)

Cecilia Barbieri, UNESCO/Education Sector: Brief overview on memory and education (10 min)

Nigel Crawhall, UNESCO/Science Sector: Brief overview on UNESCO policy on engaging with indigenous peoples (10 min)

Group Discussion

12.50 – 13.00 **Wrap-up with most salient points of the session**
Rapporteur of the Meeting

13.00 – 14.30 **LUNCH BREAK** IIEP Canteen, Ground floor

14.30 – 17.30 **SECOND SESSION | Evaluating associative values**

Susan Denyer and **Gwenaëlle Bourdin**: Presentation of ICOMOS Discussion Paper on Evaluations of World Heritage Nominations related to Sites Associated with Memories of Recent Conflicts (30 min)

Group Discussion

17.20 – 17.30   **Wrap-up with most salient points of the session**
Rapporteur of the Meeting

09.30 – 10.00   Welcome coffee offered to participants (2nd floor)

10.00 – 12.50   **THIRD SESSION | Challenges: biased views versus Outstanding Universal Value**

Can sites associated with memories of recent conflicts be compatible with the spirit of the World Heritage Convention and the notion of Outstanding Universal Value?
Group discussion

12.50 – 13.00   **Wrap-up with most salient points of the session**
Rapporteur of the Meeting

13.00 – 14.30   **LUNCH BREAK**   IIEP Canteen, Ground floor

14.30 – 17.30   **FOURTH SESSION | The way forward**
Develop guidance on whether and how these sites might relate to the purpose and scope of the World Heritage Convention
Group discussion

17.20 – 17.30   **Wrap-up with most salient points of the session**
Rapporteur of the Meeting

18.00   [Meeting of the Drafting Group working on the first draft of the final report]
Restricted participation

09.30–10.00   Welcome coffee offered to participants (2nd floor)

10.00 – 13.00   **FIFTH SESSION | Collective review of the first draft of the final report and recommendations**
Led by the **Chair of the Meeting** and **Mechtild Rössler, Director, UNESCO World Heritage Centre**

**Expert meeting on sites associated with recent conflicts
and other negative and divisive memories**

**4-6 December 2019
UNESCO-IIPE (Paris)**

List of participants

Experts

Mr Charles Akibodé
Director
Institute of Cultural Heritage
Cape Verde

Mr Antonio Arantes
Icomos International Committee on Intangible
Cultural Heritage
Vice-President
Department of Anthropology
UNICAMP – State University of Campinas
Brazil

Mr Ricardo Brodsky Baudet
Director
National Museum Benjamin Vicuña Mackenna
National Service of the Cultural Heritage
Ministry of Culture, Arts and Heritage
Chile

Mr Visoth Chhay
Museum Practitioner
Tuol Sleng Genocide Museum
Cambodia

Ms Isabelle Longuet
Heritage Expert
France

Mr Dawson Munjeri
Heritage Expert
Zimbabwe

Ms Katarzyna Piotrowska
Head of the Centre for World Heritage, focal
point for World Heritage
National Heritage Board of Poland
Poland

Ms Elizabeth Silkes
Executive Director
International Coalition of Sites of Conscience
United States of America

Mr Ahmed Skounti
Institut national des sciences de l'archéologie
et du patrimoine – INSAP
Department of Anthropology
Morocco

Ms Annie Tohmé-Tabet
Anthropologue, Professeur
Département de Sociologie et Anthropologie
Faculté des Lettres et des Sciences Humaines
Université Saint-Joseph de Beyrouth
Lebanon

Mr Eric Zerrudo
Center for Conservation of Cultural Property
and Environment in the Tropics
University of Santo Tomas
Philippines

Resource Persons

Ms Olwen Beazley
Manager
Historic & World Heritage
Park Cultural Values and Planning
NSW National Parks and Wildlife Service
Australia

Ms Christina Cameron
Professor and Chairholder
Canada Research Chair on Built Heritage
University of Montreal
Canada

Mr Albino Jopela
Head of Programmes
African World Heritage Fund

Mr Jean-Louis Luxen
President
Culture, Heritage and Development –
International
Belgium

Mr Christopher Young
Heritage Consultant
United Kingdom

Ms Dacia Viejo Rose [written contribution]
University Lecturer (Heritage)
Department of Archaeology
University of Cambridge

Advisory Bodies

Ms Gwenaëlle Bourdin
Director
Evaluation Unit
ICOMOS International

Ms Susan Denyer
Expert
c/o ICOMOS International

Mr Fujio Ichihara
Project Manager
Sites Unit
ICCROM

Ms Eugene Jo
Programme Coordinator
ICCROM-IUCN World Heritage Leadership
Programme
Sites Unit
ICCROM

UNESCO

Ms Mechtild Rössler
Director
World Heritage Centre

Mr Alessandro Balsamo
Chief of the Nominations Unit
World Heritage Centre

Ms Luba Janikova
Nominations Unit
World Heritage Centre

Mr Tiago Faccioli Lopes
Nominations Unit
World Heritage Centre

Mr Gabriel Grancher
Nominations Unit
World Heritage Centre

UNESCO REPRESENTATIVES FROM OTHER SECTORS

Mr Fackson Banda
Memory of the World Programme
Section for Universal Access and Preservation
Knowledge Societies Division
Communication and Information Sector

Ms Cecilia Barbieri
Chief of Section
Global Citizenship and Peace Education
Division of Peace and Sustainable
Development
Education Sector

Mr Nigel Crawhall [written contribution]
Chief of Section
Small Islands and Indigenous Knowledge
Science Sector

Appendix D

REVIEW GROUP FOR STUDY ON SITES ASSOCIATED WITH RECENT CONFLICTS AND OTHER NEGATIVE AND DIVISIVE MEMORIES

Mr Antonio ARANTES
ICOMOS International Committee on Intangible Cultural Heritage
Vice-President
Department of Anthropology
UNICAMP – State University of Campinas
Brazil

Mr Jean-Louis LUXEN
Board Member – International Coalition of Sites of Conscience
Former Secretary General of ICOMOS
Belgium

Mr Ahmed SKOUNTI
Institut national des sciences de l'archéologie et du Patrimoine
Rabat
Maroc

Mr Souayibou VARISSOU
Director
African World Heritage Fund
Midrand
South Africa

Mr Christopher YOUNG
Heritage Consultant
Oxford
United Kingdom

Ms Eugene JO
Programme Coordinator
ICCROM-IUCN World Heritage Leadership Programme
Sites Unit
ICCROM

WORLD HERITAGE SITES ASSOCIATED WITH RECENT CONFLICTS AND OTHER NEGATIVE AND DIVISIVE MEMORIES INSCRIBED UNDER CRITERION (VI)

Property Name (State Party)	Year listed (criteria)	Association(s) based on criterion (vi) wording	OUV in criterion (vi) statement	"Site of recent conflicts" (see 2.1.2)
Island of Gorée (Senegal)	1978 (vi)	Events Ideas	- from the 15th to the 19th century, was the largest slave-trading centre of the African coast - testimony to one of the greatest tragedies in the history of human society: the slave trade - memory island	No
Auschwitz Birkenau German Nazi Concentration and Extermination Camp (1940-1945) (Poland)	1979 (vi)	Events Ideas	- deliberate genocide of the Jews by the German Nazi regime and countless others - irrefutable evidence to one of the greatest crimes ever perpetrated against humanity - monument to the strength of the human spirit - key place of memory for the whole of humankind for the Holocaust, racist policies and barbarism - place of our collective memory of this dark chapter in the history of humanity, - warning of the many threats and tragic consequences of extreme ideologies and denial of human dignity	Yes

Property Name (State Party)	Year listed (criteria)	Association(s) based on criterion (vi) wording	OUV in criterion (vi) statement	"Site of recent conflicts" (see 2.1.2)
Forts and Castles, Volta, Greater Accra, Central and Western Regions (Ghana)	1979 (vi)	Events Ideas	- shaped history of the world over four centuries as the focus of first the gold trade and then the slave trade - symbol of European-African encounters and of the starting point of the African Diaspora	No
National History Park – Citadel, Sans Souci, Ramiers (Haiti)	1982 (iv) (vi)	Events Ideas	- universal symbols of liberty, being the first monuments to be constructed by black slaves who had gained their freedom - first state founded in the contemporary epoch by black slaves who had won their liberty.	No
Hiroshima Peace Memorial (Genbaku Dome) (Japan)	1996 (vi)	Events Ideas	- symbol of the achievement of world peace for more than half a century following the unleashing of the most destructive force ever created by humankind	Yes
Robben Island (South Africa)	1999 (iii) (vi)	Ideas	- symbol of triumph of the human spirit, of freedom and of democracy over oppression	Yes
Stone Town of Zanzibar (United Republic of Tanzania)	2000 (ii) (iii) (vi)	Events Ideas	- great symbolic importance in the suppression of slavery, since it was one of the main slave-trading ports in East Africa and also the base from which its opponents, such as David Livingstone, conducted their campaign	No
Masada (Israel)	2001 (iii) (iv) (vi)	Ideas	- symbol both of Jewish cultural identity and, more universally, of the continuing human struggle between oppression and liberty	No

Property Name (State Party)	Year listed (criteria)	Association(s) based on criterion (vi) wording	OUV in criterion (vi) statement	"Site of recent conflicts" (see 2.1.2)
Kunta Kinteh Island and Related Sites (Gambia)	2003 (iii) (vi)	Ideas	- directly and tangibly associated with the beginning and the conclusion of the slave trade, retaining its memory related to the African Diaspora	No
Old Bridge Area of the Old City of Mostar (Bosnia and Herzegovina)	2005 (vi)	Ideas	- symbol of coexistence of communities from diverse cultural, ethnic and religious backgrounds, and human solidarity for peace and powerful cooperation in the face of overwhelming catastrophes	Yes
Aapravasi Ghat (Mauritius)	2006 (vi)	Events Ideas	- first site chosen by the British Government in 1834 for the 'great experiment' in the use of indentured, rather than slave labour - associated with memories of almost half a million indentured labourers moving from India to Mauritius to work on sugar cane plantations or to be transshipped to other parts of the world	No
Le Morne Cultural Landscape (Mauritius)	2008 (iii) (vi)	Ideas Living traditions	- symbol of slaves' fight for freedom, their suffering, and their sacrifice - relevance to the countries from which the slaves came – in particular the African mainland, Madagascar and India and South-east Asia	No
Cidade Velha, Historic Centre of Ribeira Grande (Cabo Verde)	2009 (ii) (iii) (vi)	Events	- history of enslavement and trafficking of African peoples - cradle of the first mixed-race Creole culture which spread to different colonial contexts of the Caribbean and Americas	No

Property Name (State Party)	Year listed (criteria)	Association(s) based on criterion (vi) wording	OUV in criterion (vi) statement	"Site of recent conflicts" (see 2.1.2)
Australian Convict Sites (Australia)	2010 (iv) (vi)	Events Ideas	- transportation of criminals, delinquents, and political prisoners to colonial lands - symbol of active phase in the occupation of colonial lands to the detriment of the Aboriginal peoples - illustrates process of creating a colonial population of European origin through the dialectic of punishment and transportation followed by forced labour and social rehabilitation to the eventual social integration by forced labour and social rehabilitation to the eventual social integration of convicts as settlers	No
Bikini Atoll Nuclear Test Site (Marshall Islands)	2010 (iv) (vi)	Events Ideas	- associated with escalation of the Cold War - gave rise to a large number of international movements advocating nuclear disarmament; powerful symbols and to many images associated with the "nuclear era", which characterized the second part of the 20th century	No
Landscape of Grand Pré (Canada)	2012 (v) (vi)	Events Ideas	- place of remembrance of the Acadian diaspora, dispersed by the Grand Dérangement in mid-18th century - memorial constructions - symbolic re-appropriation of the land of their origins by the Acadians, in the 20th century, in a spirit of peace and cultural sharing with the English-speaking community	No

Property Name (State Party)	Year listed (criteria)	Association(s) based on criterion (vi) wording	OUV in criterion (vi) statement	"Site of recent conflicts" (see 2.1.2)
Blue and John Crow Mountains (Jamaica)	2015 (iii) (vi) (x)	Events Ideas Living traditions Beliefs	- directly associated with events that led to the liberation, and continuing freedom and survival, of groups of fugitive enslaved Africans who found refuge in the mountains [Representative List of Intangible Heritage, 2008]	No
Valongo Wharf Archaeological Site (Brazil)	2017 (vi)	Events Ideas	- associated with the historic arrival of enslaved Africans on the American continent - a site of conscience, which illustrates strong and tangible associations to one of the most terrible crimes of humanity, the enslavement of hundreds of thousands of people creating the largest forced migration movement in history	No

Appendix F

CHECKLIST OF QUESTIONS TO CONSIDER WHEN EMBARKING ON A MEMORIALIZATION PROJECT

- **Goals:** What is the goal of the initiative? Is it to recognize survivors and victims? Does it foster reconciliation? Will it promote civic engagement and contribute to democracy- building processes? Is it a part of ongoing truth-telling processes? Will it focus on education for non-repetition of the past?

- **Timing and Sequencing**: Are stakeholders ready to participate in the project? Is the public ready to engage in the issues that the project raises or will the project bring underlying, unresolved tensions to the fore? How does the project relate to other transitional justice and post-conflict reconstruction mechanisms? Does it build on recommendations from a truth commission process?

- **Initiators**: Who are the initiators of the project? Do the initiators have enough legitimacy in the community and among stakeholders to embark upon such a project?

- **Stakeholders**: Who are the key stakeholders of the project? Whose stories does the project seek to represent? If stakeholders are not initiating the project, have they been consulted about plans for the project? How will they be included into all phases of the project? What are the main target groups for the project?

- **Resources:** What are the various resources available for the project? Given the resources available and the goal of the project, what is the most appropriate form for the project to take? Will it be a museum, memorial or a memory project? Can an existing site be revived through dialogue programs?

- **Consultations:** What is the plan for consultation and information sharing with the stakeholders and the broader public? Who needs to be included in all phases of the project? What mechanisms will be put into place to ensure ongoing communication between initiators and stakeholders?

- **Public Awareness**: Will you undertake public campaigns to raise awareness about the project? If it is a national project, what kinds of awareness raising projects will be undertaken to ensure broader public inclusion and awareness?

- **Research:** What kind of research will be undertaken and for what purposes? Will the research take the form of interviews, village meetings, focus groups or public surveys? Will the research be used to inform a collections process, to develop an exhibition or to become a part of an archive?

- **Making Linkages**: How does your project inform or 'talk to' other similar projects? Will you be making connections to other similar projects?

- **Long-Term Vision**: What is the long-term vision for the project? How will you ensure that the project meets the evolving needs of the stakeholders and broader public? Are there specific programs that will be implemented to ensure ongoing public engagement?

See: Naidu, Ereshnee, Bix Gabriel, and Mofidul Hoque, International Coalition of Sites of Conscience. *From Memory to Action: a Toolkit for Memorialization in Post-Conflict Societies,* 2nd ed. [s.l.]: Amnesty Commission, Governo Federal Brasil, Ministry of Justice, n.d., 41-42. https://forum.savingplaces.org/HigherLogic/System/DownloadDocumentFile.ashx?Documen tFileKey=a9c268c5-365a-aeaf-7e62-b848dd893eca&forceDialog=0