



# **The Cultural Heritage as a Resource in Conflict Resolution**

## **An Overview of the Field**

**Gustav Wollentz**

**08 05 2014**

**Kalmar, Sweden**

## Summary

This study is an overview of research and projects that have been carried out concerning how the cultural heritage can be used as a resource in conflict resolution. It has focused on answering two interconnected questions: “Which methods are working?” and “How can the cultural heritage make a difference in conflict resolution?”.

### *Which methods are working?*

The past should preferably be presented from *multiple perspectives*. In such a way it can be used to challenge the exclusive national narratives. This would resemble a way to find “other voices” through the cultural heritage, and let those speak, for example those that might have been silenced within the national narrative. Instead of presenting a fixed cultural identity and a fixed narrative, the complexities of the individual would be highlighted if the culture is being perceived as flexible and in development, rather than homogenous. In such a way, a *sense* of a *shared* human identity can be expressed, instead of a cultural one, making it possible to express understanding and forgiveness over cultural borders.

The importance does not lie in presenting facts to a passive “audience” but rather in the ideas and the thoughts that the cultural heritage *wakes* in people. The use of cultural heritage should address a moving target, with the realization that the past is in continuous creation and so are perspectives upon it. This demands an approach that is organic in character, rather than static. A *process-oriented* approach through *dialogue* would be one way of achieving this. By promoting the process instead, one can avoid the danger in “losing” control of the perceived symbolic value of the heritage.

If a project feels “forced down” upon people, the chances of it being successful decrease, and the risk of “losing” control of the meaning(s) it tries to address will increase. This issue works both on a geographical as well as a social and cultural level. Therefore, projects should be planned through dialogue with those it involved, bottom-up instead of top-down. When listening to local perspectives in developing the project, local *places* as well as *the intangible heritage* become crucial factors. By connecting the project with the intangible heritage the people for whom the project is created, will relate to it to a larger degree. In such a way, it will be perceived as relevant for them and they will therefore be easier to reach. For the same reason, the intangible heritage could preferably be tied to a particularly *locally significant place*. However, the issue of time is essential, and in extreme cases of recent turmoil, the best method for reconciliation might not be to address the past as individually relatable; but rather *the past as past, as an alien evil*, with the hope of it

staying that way.

*How can the cultural heritage make a difference?*

One significant factor in the use of the cultural heritage is the perceived importance in remembering. There can be a *moral sense of duty* to those dead; that the people alive today have a debt to remember those that are gone. If the dead individuals somehow have been forgotten within the national narrative, this duty can build into a powerful force wanting their stories to be acknowledged in order right a historical wrong-doing. Remembrance can then be of significance because the need to *move on* is prevailing, and as long as the past is not addressed there is no possibility to neither forgive nor move on.

When the cultural heritage is used in ways that present multiple perspectives and readings of events it will *promote tolerance* towards other human beings and cultures. If cultural identities are perceived as flexible and vibrant, it can thus bridge distances between human beings instead of increasing them. When the project is successful, the people involved will hopefully come to a realization through the personally relatable that, despite cultural differences, there are more aspects that unites human beings than disunites them. Highly connected to its resource in promoting tolerance, is its capacity to form active, critically thinking individuals who are capable of voicing *democratic* values. The cultural heritage can in such a way help in forming democratic citizens. However, the level of successfulness in promoting democratic values depends on how well the work is integrated with important local issues.

## Contents

<b>1. Introduction</b>	<b>5</b>
Goals	5
Method	5
Background	6
<b>2. Which methods are working?</b>	<b>9</b>
Pluralizing the past	9
A process-oriented approach through dialogue	11
The local perspectives and the intangible heritage	14
The past as past	16
<b>3. How can the cultural heritage make a difference?</b>	<b>18</b>
The importance in remembering	18
Promoting tolerance	19
Promoting democratic values	20
<b>4. Discussion</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>5. Conclusions</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>6. References</b>	<b>27</b>

## Appendix

<b>Research Projects</b>	<b>31</b>
CRIC	31
EuNaMus	32
Visnja Kisic	32
<b>Projects/organisations with global scale</b>	<b>33</b>
Alliance for Historical Dialogue and Accountability	33
Bridging Ages	33
Cultural Heritage Without Borders	34
The Dialogues on Historical Justice and Memory	34
Sites of Conscience	34
INMP	35
<b>Projects with smaller/regional scale</b>	<b>35</b>
Art, Performance and Media in (Post-) Conflict Societies	35
Diversity Challenges	36
Facing the Past – Shaping the Future	37
Healing Through Remembering	37
History Education Beyond Borders	37
Joint History Project	38
PUSH	38
Shikaya – Facing the Past	39
<b>Significant Anthologies</b>	<b>39</b>

# **The Cultural Heritage as a Resource in Conflict Resolution**

## **1. Introduction**

This study aims to present an overview of research and projects that have been carried out concerning how the cultural heritage can be used as a resource in conflict resolution. It will also address possible ways forward. It is part of a larger project by the name of “*Applied heritage, conflict resolution through cultural history*”, which is centered in the Kalmar County Museum, Sweden, with partners in multiple European countries spanning an extensive list of fields and expertise, from Universities, County Museums and a Media Company. In recent research there has been a great deal of focus on how the cultural heritage can be used as a “weapon” in conflict. A significant amount of attention have been on when the cultural heritage is applied to foster division rather than bring people together (see Ashworth *et al* 2007). However, the goal of this project is to study in which ways and to which results the cultural heritage can be applied to heal wounds in a divided society.

### *Goals*

This study will focus on answering two interconnected issues.

- ♣ Which methods can be used to bring reconciliation through the cultural heritage?

Which methods have been tested and seem to be working? What can we learn from those methods? Can we possibly learn something from the methods that have failed or do not seem to be working?

- ♣ How can the cultural heritage make a difference in conflict resolution?

In what way can its potential for reconciliation be noted? Which results in peoples' lives can be perceived?

### *Method*

My method has been to read the previous research concerning how the cultural heritage can be used in conflict resolution. I have also read the reports and articles available from the projects that I have deemed relevant. These projects can be focused on anything from theater, storytelling and time travels, where the cultural heritage has been involved for the sake of reconciliation. I have studied

research projects, global organisations as well as smaller and more regional NGOs. These projects are listed in the Appendix. Due to time issues it has not been possible to read and take into consideration every project and article that have focused on these issues. My primary focus has been on projects connected to the European context, but I have also taken into consideration significant projects of global scale. Even if it does not include a complete survey of the field, I hope that the results presented can point to general tendencies in the research and serve as an overview of what has been achieved in the field so far, as well as suggesting steps forward.

### *Background*

“Sweden has been a christian country for more than a thousand years. Christianity is intimately linked with the Swedish culture and identity. Few other ideas and institutions have been as significant for the formation of the Swedish culture as christianity and the Swedish church. The Swedish language, art, literature, philosophy, moral, traditions, architecture, music and more, are all examples of aspects of the society that has been and still is strongly inspired by our christian heritage (...). Christianity should by the force of its history be allowed to hold a special place in comparison to other religions in Sweden.” (<https://sverigedemokraterna.se/var-politik/religionen/>) My translation.

There is obviously a strong sense of force in history. Here, the party Swedish Democrats are using the “force” of history to legitimize the considered “supremacy” of christianity in Sweden. Clearly, this has less to do with christianity, per se, and more to do with the practice of Islam. The text is indirectly aimed against the practice of Islam in a not-so subtle way. The force of history is used to legitimize “discrimination” against other religions, mainly Islam, for example linked to the building of mosques in Sweden (see for example <http://nyheter24.se/nyheter/politik/762081-sd-kraftsamlade-mot-moske-fick-ihop-28-underskrifter>). But what kind of “force” is there in history? And just as significant; *which* and *whose* history is there a force in? Well, history is everyones and no-ones. The force does not lie in history *it self*, the force lies in how it is used and for which purpose (see Ashworth *et al* 2007).

When the “force” of history is used for various purposes, it is based on a highly selective use of history. For the simple reason that *not* being selective would be ludicrous. The slave-trade was *once* legitimized by its history. The patriarchal society *still is*. Humans have always been killing each other in various wars and should, naturally, for *that very reason*, continue doing so. Actually,

*nothing* can be legitimized just because “we have always been doing so”. Other arguments are desperately needed. Clearly, the Swedish Democrats are using the force of history as an argument against Islam, because it serves their purpose. To express it bluntly: their use of the “force” of history has nothing to do with history and everything to do with intention. The past is transformed into a weapon.

The destruction of the cultural heritage has been widely used to sow division in recent conflicts, for example in the Balkans during the 90s where the most well-known example is the Ottoman bridge in Mostar. This destruction has been regarded as an example of symbolically killing the memory of unity between two cultural groups, in this case between Croats and Bosnians. Tunbridge and Ashworth call cases of conflicted heritage as *dissonant heritage*. Dissonant heritage is the kind of heritage that is contested between groups, that is, where different groups place contradicting meanings in the heritage (Tunbridge & Ashworth 1996). This kind of heritage *can* ultimately lead to violent conflict. The destruction of the Babri Mosque, in 1992, India, is one example of this. It was destroyed because it was rumored to be built upon a Hindu temple, and the destruction of it led to waves of violence between Hindu and Muslim groups over the country, killing thousands of people (<http://www.bbc.com/news/world-south-asia-11436552>). Archaeological excavations have taken place on the destroyed area of the mosque, but the results are unclear (Harrison 2010). The supposed “truth” is not relevant in these cases and whether the mosque was built upon a temple or not is hardly the issue. The past *in it self* can be used for any purpose depending on the intention which is illustrated by the quote by the Swedish Democrats. In the case of the Babri Mosque, one contradicted meaning in the past is used to legitimize the destruction of a mosque. In other words, the past can even be used to legitimize the destruction of the past. Rather, focusing on the truth here would only further increase the violence. In this instance, a contested meaning on a heritage site culminated in the death of thousands of people, and re-opening not-yet healed wounds between Muslims and Hindus.

The well-known destruction of the Buddha statues in Afghanistan is yet another example. The official explanation is that it was destroyed by Taliban because gods should not be depicted. However, more significantly, this can be regarded as a gap between the global significance attributed to the Buddha statues, and the local significance where other kinds of heritage were being valued. It was a statement directed at global organizations like UNESCO and ultimately the western

world as a whole, with what was perceived as a “forced down” conception of heritage, where certain sites were valued by the global heritage industry whereas others were forgotten (Harrison 2010). This is an example of the dissonance that can occur between the local and the global meaning attributed to a site (Viejo-Rose 2011b).

However, as argued by the recent Faro Convention (2005), the cultural heritage can also be addressed to foster reconciliation. The Faro Convention was developed by the Council of Europe, and it states:

(...) in the face of the present crisis relating to political representation, economic models and cultural identity, heritage provides answers by fostering **citizen participation**, promoting itself as a **resource** rooted in continuity and sustainability, and becoming a factor for **dialogue** as a source of respect and social cohesion. ([http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/cultureheritage/heritage/Identities/Faro\\_en.asp](http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/cultureheritage/heritage/Identities/Faro_en.asp))

In contrast to the attention given to how the cultural heritage can be used a weapon, this study will follow the lines of the Faro Convention, and present how it can help to bring reconciliation.

However, as argued by Dacia Viejo-Rose: “Only by recognizing its potential to impart messages of fear, domination and violence can its potential as a resource in reconciliation be engaged and any historical grievances linked to it addressed.” (Viejo-Rose 2011b: 214) In other words, when using the cultural heritage as a positive force for bringing people together, one need *also be aware* of the possible dangers in how the cultural heritage can be “mistreated” to further divide people.



## 2. Which methods are working?

In this chapter I will present various methods that have been used in conflict resolution. I will achieve this by dealing with one significant aspect at a time. This will also shed light on some of the dangers and possible pitfalls that can occur when working with these issues.

### *Pluralizing the past*

It seems like the research carried out has reached a consensus that the so-called national narratives should preferably be challenged by different viewpoints (see for example: Ashworth *et al* 2007; Billingsley & Wertsch 2011; Gustafsson 2010; Kutma 2012; Šebek 2010; Ševčenko 2011; Viejo-Rose 2011a&b; Williams 2012; Wing 2011). As Karel Anthonie Bakker and Liana Müller write:

“The authors argue (...) for open-ended heritage places where the emphasis is not necessarily on achieving consensus, but where contradictions, complexity and conflicts, due to inevitable differences in interpretation, may be continuously explored and debated, and seen as an opportunity for an increase in cultural vibrancy and cultural tolerance.” (Bakker & Müller 2010: 53-54)

In many ways, this would resemble a way to find “other voices” through the cultural heritage, and let those speak. The national narratives are naturally exclusive in character, that is, they include certain people (often connected to a geographical area and/or a certain ethnical majority) while excluding some, to form a strong sense of an exclusive national identity. This can be noted in National Museums, like the Military Museum in Turkey, where a linear, chronological and highly exclusive story from Atilla the Hun to Atatürk is traced. This sort of strong national narrative can be especially strong in so-called newly emerging national states, where there is a need to construct a grand history in the lack of a real one (Aronsson 2011). This is for example true in the case of Estonia, where an exclusive national identity has been presented at the national museums since the independence from the Soviet Union (Kutma 2012). Here, the cultural heritage is applied to build a powerful sense of a united nation.

However, this form of rhetoric can also be found in the political agenda of various nationalistic parties that are spreading in present-day Europe. To foster reconciliation the national narrative should preferably be challenged, and be made inclusive instead of exclusive (Billingsley & Wertsch 2011). There are ways in which those alternative views can be found. One method is to focus on the voices that have been silenced in history, for example children, women or socially or economically

poor. Another way is to focus on the victims on *both* sides of a conflict, instead of just one, and in such a way, a *mutual* understanding of the tragedy of war can be found.

What signifies the national narratives are that they do not include layers; they are one-sided, often chronological and has a sense of a fixed, static, historical truth, about them. As if the perceived development from then to today is *natural*, and that the present-day is an inevitable culmination of this process. This is certainly the result of an illusion based on an imagined exclusive and shared history (Anderson 1991; Balibar 2002). It is quite easy to contradict this perspective through the cultural heritage, and instead of presenting a fixed truth, focus on the multi-layered and contradictory pieces of the cultural heritage, where history is not presented as “linear” but rather as “chaotic” and “fragmentary”. Inspired by the work of Pierre Nora, Dacia Viejo-Rose argues that a sense of *historical memory* can be applied to counter the *grand narrative*, presented by the state. She means that historical memory would take into account diversity and occasional divergence, *without* succumbing to the individual and deeply context-dependent memory (Viejo-Rose 2011a: 63).

Another method of challenging the national narrative would be to go from the particular to the universal. Cornelius Holtorf writes: “(...) the new cultural heritage can transcend cultural particularism by promoting values and virtues derived from humanism and a commitment to global solidarity.” (Holtorf 2011: 14) To achieve this, one possible way would be to begin with a focus on a particular issue or a local phenomenon, that can be “raised” to discuss universal human factors that would be relevant for everyone (see Westergren & Hunner 2011). One example of where this method is being practiced is the Peace Museum in Guernica, Spain. The museum is a member of the organization “Sites of Conscience”, which is an important global organization for museums dealing with how they can serve as a resource in conflict resolution. I will discuss them more thoroughly in the next chapter (<http://www.sitesofconscience.org>). The museum deals with the bombings of Guernica during the Spanish civil war. However, Guernica is also used to discuss the issues of peace and war in the world today, with particular emphasize on the significance of equality and freedom for the establishment of peace in the world. The museum goes from the particular to the universal ([http://www.museodelapaz.org/en/expo\\_des\\_en.php?idexposicion=2](http://www.museodelapaz.org/en/expo_des_en.php?idexposicion=2)).

A project where presenting multiple perspectives has been the goal is the Joint History Project

(JHP), concerning the education in eleven states in south eastern Europe. It is aimed primarily at teachers, but its results are meant to affect the new generation growing up in south eastern Europe. The project developed based on a realization that the education in these eleven countries presented a linear and stereotyped history, painted in black and white with good and bad sides in each conflict. A large amount of new school books have been written within the project, where multiple perspectives have been addressed, including those of children and women, with a focus on individuals. Furthermore, 28 workshops have been carried out in which over 700 teachers have been trained (as of 2010) (Šebek 2010). A similar project aimed at teachers is Shikaya – Facing the Past, based in South Africa. This project focuses on workshops, seminars and discussions, where a more dynamic and complex way of teaching about the past is aimed at (<http://shikaya.org>).

Many of these projects are excellent example of where the national narratives are being challenged by other perspectives. What signifies national narratives are a perceived sense of a homogenous cultural identity, which is an illusion since the cultural identity is flexible, overlapping and in constant development (Hastrup 2010). Instead of presenting a fixed cultural identity and a fixed narrative, the complexities of the individual would be highlighted if the culture is being perceived as flexible and in development, rather than homogenous. In such a way, a sense of a *shared* human identity can be expressed, instead of a cultural one, making it possible to express understanding and forgiveness over cultural borders. This last point leads us into the next issue of importance, which is the significance of the process it self.

#### *A process-oriented approach through dialogue*

With the realization that a static and never-changing truth about the past should preferably be avoided, the importance does not lie in presenting facts to a passive “audience” but rather in the ideas and the thoughts that the cultural heritage *wakes* in people. Ashworth *et al* argues that the use of cultural heritage should address a moving target, with the realization that the past is in continuous creation and so are perspectives upon it (Ashworth *et al* 2007: 207). This demands an approach that is organic in character, rather than static, and there are various methods in which this can be achieved.

Sites of Conscience (SoC), which is a global organization for museums, warns of the dangers in using the cultural heritage as a “blunt” political instrument. According to SoC, this will encourage

passivity. The method SoC promotes is not to tell people how to think through exhibitions, but make visitors shape their own answers through reflection and, importantly, through dialogue. To achieve this the museums present events nuanced from various perspectives without telling people *which* perspective would be the right one, and by drawing explicit connections to contemporary issues. They discuss the implications of the past for the present. Furthermore, SoC tries to create environments that involve *ongoing* debate and action. This includes dialogue through face-to-face discussion as well publishing, public tours and media attention. Museums transform into arenas for sharing ideas and promoting discussion and reflection, where the processes of thoughts that wakes inside peoples heads are made central. This process will ultimately promote action in individuals instead of passivity, argues SoC (Ševčenko 2010; 2011).

This is clearly a statement partially directed against many politically motivated uses of the cultural heritage, where the building of one big expensive monument of commemoration tend to be constructed at the expense of more lasting and process-oriented approaches. This is connected to the fact that political actions tend to value short-term affects over more lasting ones, mainly the effects until the next election within four years. The immediate impact that can be clearly measured is at the centre of attention, rather than the lasting ones (Ševčenko 2011). By promoting the process instead, one can also avoid the danger in “losing” control of the perceived symbolic value of a monument. How sites affect people are not easily controllable, and if the goal is to present a *static* statement the risk of losing control is unavoidably larger. A monument commemorating the victims of a conflict can *also* be perceived as a monument meant to induce guilt in those alive today that were not able to prevent it, which recently occurred in Serbia (Viejo-Rose 2011a). However, the fact that meanings are constantly developing, and in themselves plural in character, could be embraced instead of being perceived as a danger. To be able to embrace the contradictory and developing nature of “meanings”, dialogue between people should be made central, where no perspective is made less or more than anyone else's.

There are many projects which can be a perceived as dialogue-oriented. The Outreach Team at English Heritage, involve community performances including theater and dance, where people otherwise excluded from the cultural heritage are made participative through bodily movement and performance. One project involved people newly arrived in England, where they participated by taking parts in a theater discussing the meaning of home and the struggle to make home in a new

environment. The *process* of participating in the play, of practicing and playing in front of an audience, and in the discussion of these individually relevant issues, promoted reflection among those involved concerning their own situation without providing a fixed answer (Levin 2010). Similar goals can be found at the global organization Bridging Ages, where time travels are being performed to discuss relevant and pressing social issues through the past, by the process of participating in time travels (Westergren & Hunner 2011). I will discuss Bridging Ages more thoroughly later on. Another project aimed at promoting discussion and reflection is Healing Through Remembering (HTR) in Ireland, concerning the troubles in Northern Ireland. HTR arranges conversational workshops to promote discussions from as many perspectives as possible. Their starting point is that there are no set answers for dealing with the past ([www.healingthroughremembering.org](http://www.healingthroughremembering.org); Wing 2011).

Another way of promoting dialogue is establishing networks of exchange. The Swedish organization Cultural Heritage Without Borders, mainly focusing on reconstructions of the cultural heritage in the Balkans, have developed a regional network for museums (the Regional Museum Network), including a network for females in both managing and chief positions, as well as a network for regional cooperation and exchange between NGOs (the South Eastern Europe Heritage Network) in the heritage sector (Källemark 2007; Ljungman & Taboroff 2011). Both of these networks have been successful and they are contributing to increased dialogue through a sharing of experiences.

I have now presented a few projects which were process-oriented instead of fixed and static. The underlying key in the projects achieving this seems to be by dialogue promoting reflection. Of course, most projects have a fixed beginning and an end. Before it begins, the project should be developed through dialogue with those it involves. This state is crucial, and it is of significance to take your time in building and planning the project together with those it involves. Furthermore, the ambition should be that the effects of the project will last longer than the actual life-span of the project. This means that the impact of a successful project will continue on into the future (Levin 2010). The focus on dialogue will naturally lead us into the next chapter which will deal with the importance of the local perspectives and places.

### *The local perspectives and the intangible heritage*

If a project feels “forced down” upon people, the chances of it being successful decrease, and the risk of “losing” control of the meaning(s) it tries to address will increase. Nenad Šebek writes that she believes that one of the reasons for the success behind the above-mentioned Joint History Project (JHP) is that it is created from the region and for the region. It thus has an inside and bottom-up perspective (Šebek 2010). Ashworth *et al* 2007 argues that “Social and cultural cohesion depend upon the attainment of locally acceptable formulae for the pluralization of the past.” (Ashworth *et al* 2007: 211) This issue works both on a geographical as well as a social and cultural level. If the project is created and planned from far-away or from a different cultural point of view, without taking local perspectives in mind, it will be perceived as forced upon people from “outside”. Furthermore, if it is created and planned by the people in power situations, the risk of it being felt as forced down upon people from “above” are large.

Kylie Message writes about the construction of “The Centre Cultural Tjibaou” (TCCT) in New Caledonia, which was created for the indigenous Kanak-people living in the French area. TCCT can be seen as created both from outside as well as from above. The project was initiated by the french-speaking majority but the original idea came from the then assassinated Kanak Jean-Marie Tjiboau (even though it is impossible to know what he would have thought about the finished construction), as a sign of forgiveness for past cruelty. The Italian architect Renzo Piano designed huge houses resembling the traditional houses of the Kanak-people. However, they are half-constructed to counter the view of the Kanak as “stuck” in development and portray them as a vibrant culture. The area is partly used for exhibitions of Kanak-related art. However, few Kanak-people visit the centre and many are skeptical of it. They argue that they do not need a centre to be reminded of their cultural heritage and that there is no need for french people to teach them about their own culture. With sardonic sentiments, one Kanak calls it: “Kanak centre for white people.” (Message 2006: 162) However, Kylie Message's own opinion is divided and at the same time she sees it as a spectacular symbol of identity, holding the city into accounts of events in the past. (Message 2006: 165)

Projects with the best of intentions might be misinterpreted and a schism between local and global intentions are prevailing in many instances. Dacia Viejo-Rose means that the issue of time is essential. For example, there is a difference between the time needed to construct a bridge and the

time needed to mourn its destruction and be willing to see it replaced. To grasp this in a balanced way, the local perspectives are essential (Viejo-Rose 2011b: 213). In the Balkans, statues of Hollywood movie stars like Rocky Balboa and Bruce Lee have been constructed, the last one in the war-torn city of Mostar, in Bosnia. This can be approached as an example of where people themselves, quite contradictory, turn outside to find a *shared* identity because the history *within* the area is still torn by recently experienced conflict. However, they can find unity from popular culture created from outside. It represents an escape from dealing with the troubled past within their own geographical area, but it is also a fascinating example of how it is possible to use symbols from outside to try to bridge unity within. Furthermore, it shows an unwillingness to comply with an imposed vision (from above) of reconstruction (Viejo-Rose 2011b: 213; [http://www.nytimes.com/2007/11/11/world/europe/11balkans.html?\\_r=0](http://www.nytimes.com/2007/11/11/world/europe/11balkans.html?_r=0).)

When listening to local perspectives in developing the project, local *places* as well as *the intangible heritage* become crucial factors. With the intangible heritage I mean local traditions, for instance dances, and storytelling etc. One project that has been dealing particularly with stories are “Diversity Challenges” in Ireland. In this project, stories from both sides of the conflict have been gathered. Will Glendinning, coordinator in Diversity Challenges, writes:

“Storytelling is part of the way that we record and remember the past, and storytelling is increasingly recognized as an integral part of the research material for historians. It can be a positive force for reconciliation, helping in the healing and peace-building processes. However, storytelling has a positive benefit to society provided that the process is ethical and safe, so as to avoid being used to fuel a renewed conflict. As long as we recognize the possible dangers of entering into dialogue and develop a broader perspective, then the process can be one of reconciliation and healing.”

(Glendinning 2011: 108)

Similarly, Karel Anthonie Bakker and Liana Müller states: “(This article) highlights the emergence of minor and local voices in heritage commemoration, and the development of heritage commemoration that is not commodified. The authors argue for an increased emphasis on intangible heritage as an agent in the production of places of commemoration (...).” (Bakker & Müller 2010: 53-54). By connecting the project with the intangible heritage (local stories, ceremonies, traditions), the people for whom the project is created, will relate to it to a larger degree. In such a way, it will be perceived as relevant for them and they will therefor be easier to reach. For the same reason, the

intangible heritage could preferably be tied to a particularly *locally significant place* (Aronsson 2009).

The above mentioned project Bridging Ages has focused on local places and identities through Time Travels, using the method called Historic Environment Educational (HEE). The method connects history to everyday life and communities of today. By using the local and relatable as a starting point, larger issues can be dealt with. It is a matter of locating the individual within the history, and ultimately, within the world. Bridging Ages hopes to achieve this through Time Travels. Here, the physical effects of turning into *someone else* within a local and relatable landscape and history is used. Westergren & Hunner writes: “From the local to the global, from the nearby to the remote, such connections can be made by using the historic environments that surround us all.” (Westergren & Hunner 2011: 129)

### *The past as past*

To focus on the local and recent history and from there go to the global is an excellent method to reach individuals. However, when the recent past is filled with conflict, as it is for example in the Balkans, the local history is a highly sensitive issue. This can be illustrated in Russia, where the recent crimes and the victims of the Gulag camps, are not acknowledged except for a few scattered monuments. However, two museums are trying to address the past by using radically different methods. Perm-36, located in the Perm-region, is a museum (part of SoC) located at the very site of one of the camps, where thousands of prisoners (many of them being political) were being held from 1946 until 1988. This museum deals with the post-Stalin era. The other museum is located in Moscow, called Moscow Gulag Museum, and deals with Gulag camps *during* the Stalin-era. Since it is partly financed by the state the more recent history is off limits. The exhibition in Perm-36 thus deals with the more recent history while there is a distance in time for Moscow Gulag Museum. Perm-36 chooses to present history as “an alien history to be condemned, for the global good”. The Gulag Museum in Moscow on the other hand, being financed by the state, hopes to present history as “it's our history to own, for better or worse” (Williams 2012: 118).

Many people in Russia have not dealt with their recent history and express unhappiness. A considerable amount of people long back to the communist era in a somewhat romanticized way. This makes the recent atrocities in history more approachable as well as easier to grasp by



*distancing* from it and presenting it as an alien evil. However, because of the distance in time to the Stalin-era it is possible to address that period as their own history (Williams 2012). This illustrates that there are many ways in which the past can be presented depending on the local context. As previously mentioned, the issue of time is essential, and in extreme cases of recent turmoil, the best method for reconciliation might not be to address the past as individually relatable; but rather the past as past with the hope of it staying that way.

### **3. How can the cultural heritage make a difference?**

In this section I will discuss how the cultural heritage can make a difference in conflict resolution, based on the projects and research carried out. In general it seems to be harder to present concrete examples of how the cultural heritage can bring reconciliation. More research have been dealing with how to practically use the cultural heritage in conflict resolution than in examining the results of the work carried out. However, there are arguments concerning the positive effects of the cultural heritage, and I will present them here.

#### *The importance in remembering*

One significant factor in the use of the cultural heritage is the perceived importance in remembering, and this can take many forms. First of all, there can be a moral sense of duty to those dead; that the people alive today have a debt to remember those that are gone (Filippucci 2012). If the dead individuals somehow have been forgotten within the national narrative, this duty can build into a powerful force wanting their stories to be acknowledged in order right a historical wrongdoing. Refusing to address a troubled past will not make it disappear. As Dacia Viejo-Rose argues based on her studies on how Spain handled the cultural heritage after the civil war: partial memories do not erase the “other” memory, but they do infuse it with an element of confrontation (Viejo-Rose 2011b: 206). To silence certain voices will only contribute to prolong a division and could lead to violent actions between the repressed and those in control of the narrative. A step towards reconciliation would be to address these muted voices and give them the freedom to mourn and share their experiences.

Furthermore, the cultural heritage can be used to induce a sense of reassurance in people when the present-day is in rapid change. This reassurance can make people feel stronger in the face of conflict. However, remembrance can also be of significance because the need to *move on* is prevailing, and as long as the past is not addressed there is no possibility to neither forgive nor move on. The need to address the past is not necessarily because it will be used for various motives, but because people can neither progress nor forgive while it is being silenced. In such circumstances the past can be approached as an “absent present”, i.e. the past is not addressed based on its similarities with the present but because of its vast differences and the will for such things never to occur again (Filippucci 2012).

### *Promoting tolerance*

When the cultural heritage is used in ways that present multiple perspectives and readings of events it will promote tolerance towards other human beings and cultures (Bakker & Müller 2010). If cultural identities are perceived as flexible and vibrant, it can thus bridge distances between human beings instead of increasing them. As Council of Europe wrote in a report concerning the role of cultural heritage in conflict resolution: “*Heritage is a means for people to understand each other. It contributes, through tolerance, to the prevention of conflicts.*” (Council of Europe 2011) This can be achieved with a focus on human beings and cultures as multi-layered and complex, instead of presenting human beings with fixed identities within fixed cultures. For example, values can be derived from humanism and a commitment to global solidarity. In such a way, cultural particularism can be avoided (Holtorf 2011: 14). As Liz Ševčenko writes:

Rather than reacting to conflict over our heritage sites defensively, we could perhaps identify the issues underlying the conflict and offer our sites as a resource for addressing them inasmuch as heritage sites have unique resources for helping people to deal with difference, examples of how people dealt with conflict in the past, a human connection to people in other circumstances and a trusted space for learning new perspectives. (Ševčenko 2010: 21)

The more perspectives we take into consideration and the more we get our own opinions challenged by other ways of perceiving life, the more tolerant towards other expressions we will get. Therefore, if the cultural heritage is used to emotionally involve people (by the method of for example theater, time travels our museums) in other individuals' views of life there is potential for increasing tolerance (Šebek 2010; Westergren & Hunner 2011). When the project is successful, the people involved will hopefully come to a realization through the personally relatable that, despite cultural differences, there are more aspects that unites human beings than disunites them.

The particular *meaning* behind the cultural heritage is not necessarily of primary significance when it is involved in promoting tolerance between human beings. For example, Cornelius Holtorf writes: “Cultural heritage can also provide opportunities for communities to care for something fragile together and hence promote a sense of responsibility, persistence and respect for the knowledge and values of fellow residents or citizens. Social cohesion is thus advanced through the process of caring for the heritage, not through a celebration of any particular meaning it may have (Holtorf 2011: 13). Here, the act of caring for something together with other people, and not the meaning it

self, is a factor increasing tolerance and respect between human beings. Tolerance is only threatened when a particular group tries to take control of this meaning, making it exclusive.

### *Promoting democratic values*

There are various political resources in the use of cultural heritage. First of all, there are economical advantages in reconstructing the heritage. For example, reconstructing buildings use local working force, thus leading to social and economical development through employment opportunities. This is a significant issue concerning certain projects within Cultural Heritage Without Borders when they are working in areas with large unemployment (Kälvemark 2007; Ljungman & Taboroff 2011). In this section I will focus on the importance of cultural heritage in promoting democratic values. This is connected to its resource as a tool to induce tolerance. Increasing the acceptance and understanding over cultural borders will contribute to cultural freedom within a country which is an important democratic value.

Nenad Šebek, from Joint History Project (JHP), argues that the complexities within the cultural heritage can be used to increase critical thinking. Ultimately, she means that “Critical analyzing will form a participative adult who is capable of forming and voicing democratic opinions.” (Šebek 2010: 121) Something similar is put forward by Liz Ševčenko who writes that awareness of the present will increase the will in people to actively fight for change. For Sites of Conscience (SoC), the value in the cultural heritage lies in its potential to encourage people to actively participate in *creating* a more democratic world (Ševčenko 2010, 2011). Their motto is “from memory to action”. Here, the cultural heritage is not valued for its more “passive” potential to let people “move on” or join together in “caring” about something fragile, but for its potential to form an active, critical and democratic individual.

When Cultural Heritage Without Borders judged the effectiveness of one their projects, concerning restoration works in a village named Velica Hoca, a Serbian enclave in Kosovo, the report concluded:

Unforeseen effects such as the formalisation of the community organisation and the cooperation between Albanian and Serb craftsmen can be seen as building blocks that contribute to **sustainable peace** and **democratic development**. Furthermore, Velika Hoca has become a far more open community and, according to stakeholders, therefore different from other Serb enclaves that have not

received support. According to community leaders, this change is a result of the villagers work with CHwB. It can therefore be assumed that without CHwB support, tensions would have remained high and Velika Hoca would have remained isolated. While causality is difficult to prove, stakeholders, including a village leader, believe that it is plausible that CHwB's presence in Velika Hoca was one of several factors contributing to the relatively high level of participation in the election. (Ljungman & Taboroff 2011: 48)

With words like “plausible” and sentences like “causality is difficult to prove”, this text illustrates how difficult it is to value the effects that the cultural heritage has in a more scientific way, since there are many factors involved in developing a critically thinking and democratic individual. The cultural heritage can help in promoting democratic values, but naturally it works together and alongside other issues such as employment rate, social issues and education. The project in Velica Hoca suggests that the level of successfulness in promoting democratic values depends on how well the work is integrated with important local issues, which further underlines the significance of building the project together with those it involves; bottom-up instead of top-down.

#### 4. Discussion

This study shows that there are many ways in which the cultural heritage can be used as a resource in conflict resolution. However, for it to work one need also be aware of the various ways in which it can be misused as a weapon. There are possible pitfalls to fall into unless you are aware that meanings are constantly evolving and that there is no fixed truth to be presented. If those for whom a project is created are considered passive targets of a particular message concerning the past, the risk of losing control of that message will increase. The various meanings of the past as well as the people targeted, are not static but constantly in development. I therefore argue that a *process-oriented approach*, preferably through *dialogue*, would be a way to avoid a static presentation. This method should try to present history from *as many perspectives as possible*, and begin with a focus on the *local places* and the *intangible heritage*, to make it relatable, and from there highlight wider issues. The project should be developed through dialogue together with those the projects concern. Furthermore, the people planning it must be ready to get their own opinions about the cultural heritage challenged by different perceptions.

However, it is of significance to underline that there are no fixed “model” for how the cultural heritage can be applied to foster reconciliation. The projects have to be context-dependent. First of all, the issue of time is essential for how the cultural heritage should be used. There is a difference between the need for mourning the destruction of a cultural heritage and the will to see it replaced. In some cases, those who live in the area are not *ready* for the reconstruction of a destroyed heritage. Furthermore, when the recent past is filled with extreme violence, in some cases even between people living in the same cities, as it is in the Balkans, it might *not* be preferable to present history as local and personally relatable. Rather, when the recent past still is an half-open wound, it could be wiser as well as safer to present the past as past, as an *alien evil* to be condemned for the well-being of global humanitarian values. This emphasizes the obvious need to be sensitive to the political situations in the countries when dealing with the past. There is a different perception and use of the cultural heritage in newly emerging states in contrast to already established ones. I have presented methods that can be applied to foster understanding over cultural borders. When applying these it is significant to be sensitive to the local political and social situation and work with the various methods bottom-up instead of top-down.

It is somewhat difficult to present the actual effects that the cultural heritage has in bringing

reconciliation. One explanation is that the effects are difficult to gather in a scientific way, since they work alongside and are highly entangled with other important factors in society. Furthermore, they can be valuable on an unconscious level. That is, the value is not always clearly articulated. In the Faro Convention from 2005, it is stated that the cultural heritage can “foster **citizen participation**, promoting itself as a **resource** rooted in continuity and sustainability, and becoming a factor for **dialogue** as a source of respect and social cohesion.”

([http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/cultureheritage/heritage/Identities/Faro\\_en.asp](http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/cultureheritage/heritage/Identities/Faro_en.asp)) Using this convention as an important focal point, many researches argue for the importance of the cultural heritage.

However, its value can take various forms. It can be used to give voice to people who have been silenced in history, thus making it possible to forgive past atrocities and move on. It can be used to promote tolerance over cultural borders, where the meaning in the heritage it self can be less relevant than the actual act of *caring* for it. Finally, it can be used to increase democratic values, in forming a participative and critically thinking individual.

These results indicate that the field could improve in *following up* the impacts of their projects. After a finished project it is valuable to study the notable results and consider what can be taught from those. The question of *how* to study these effects need to be addressed. In what way can we possibly study the benefits of the cultural heritage for bringing reconciliation? These are important questions because we need to articulate the value of the cultural heritage in a convincing way. Right extremism with rascist incilinations are spreading all over Europe and the need for forgiveness, tolerance, democratic values and critically thinking individuals are therefor as high now as it has ever been. Especially since those very parties are using the cultural heritage for *the opposite reason*; to present the picture of a uniform and static cultural identity.

I would like to conclude that the past should preferably not be used as a blunt political instrument to present a static message. The past can be used for *any* purpose depending on motivation which makes the issue of “truth” irrelevant. Rather, the past could be used to heal wounds in a divided society by presenting it as complex and nuanced filled with individuals (not static cultures) where a fixed truth is avoided. Furthermore, the most important thing is undoubtedly to *allow* every voice to be heard, and from there, mutual understanding and forgiveness can hopefully be found.

## 5. Conclusions

*Which methods are working?*

The past should preferably be presented from *multiple perspectives*, and in such a way it can be used to challenge the so-called national narratives. These narratives are naturally exclusive in character, and by presenting multiple perspectives it can be turned inclusive instead. In many ways, this would resemble a way to find “other voices” through the cultural heritage, and let those speak, for example those that might have been silenced within the national narrative. Instead of presenting a fixed cultural identity and a fixed narrative, the complexities of the individual would be highlighted if the culture is being perceived as flexible and in development, rather than homogenous. In such a way, a *sense* of a *shared* human identity can be expressed, instead of a cultural one, making it possible to express understanding and forgiveness over cultural borders.

With the realization that a static and never-changing truth about the past should preferably be avoided, the importance does not lie in presenting facts to a passive “audience” but rather in the ideas and the thoughts that the cultural heritage *wakes* in people. The use of cultural heritage should address a moving target, with the realization that the past is in continuous creation and so are perspectives upon it. This demands an approach that is organic in character, rather than static. A *process-oriented* approach through *dialogue* would be one way of achieving this. By promoting the process instead, one can avoid the danger in “losing” control of the perceived symbolic value of the heritage. How sites affect people are not easily controllable, and if the goal is to present a *static* statement the risk of losing control is unavoidably larger. The fact that meanings are constantly developing, and in themselves plural in character, could be embraced instead of being perceived as a danger. To be able to embrace the contradictory and developing nature of “meanings”, dialogue between people should be made central, where no perspective is made less or more than anyone else's.

If a project feels “forced down” upon people, the chances of it being successful decrease, and the risk of “losing” control of the meaning(s) it tries to address will increase. This issue works both on a geographical as well as a social and cultural level. If the project is created and planned from far-away or from a different cultural point of view, without taking local perspectives in mind, it will be perceived as forced upon people from “outside”. Furthermore, if it is created and planned by the people in power situations, the risk of it being felt as forced down upon people from “above” are



large. Therefore, projects should be planned through dialogue with those it involved, bottom-up instead of top-down. When listening to local perspectives in developing the project, local *places* as well as *the intangible heritage* become crucial factors. With the intangible heritage I mean local traditions, for instance dances and storytelling. By connecting the project with the intangible heritage the people for whom the project is created, will relate to it to a larger degree. In such a way, it will be perceived as relevant for them and they will therefor be easier to reach. For the same reason, the intangible heritage could preferably be tied to a particularly *locally significant place*. However, the issue of time is essential, and in extreme cases of recent turmoil, the best method for reconciliation might not be to address the past as individually relatable; but rather *the past as past, as an alien evil*, with the hope of it staying that way.

#### *How can the cultural heritage make a difference?*

One significant factor in the use of the cultural heritage is the perceived importance in remembering, and this can take many forms. First of all, there can be a *moral sense of duty* to those dead; that the people alive today have a debt to remember those that are gone. If the dead individuals somehow have been forgotten within the national narrative, this duty can build into a powerful force wanting their stories to be acknowledged in order right a historical wrong-doing. To silence certain voices will only contribute to prolong a division and could lead to violent actions between the repressed and those in control of the narrative. A step towards reconciliation would be to address these muted voices and give them the freedom to mourn and share their experiences. Remembrance can be of significance because the need to *move on* is prevailing, and as long as the past is not addressed there is no possibility to neither forgive nor move on.

When the cultural heritage is used in ways that present multiple perspectives and readings of events it will *promote tolerance* towards other human beings and cultures. If cultural identities are perceived as flexible and vibrant, it can thus bridge distances between human beings instead of increasing them. When the project is successful, the people involved will hopefully come to a realization through the personally relatable that, despite cultural differences, there are more aspects that unites human beings than disunites them. Highly connected to its resource in promoting tolerance, is its capacity to form active, critically thinking individuals who are capable of voicing *democratic* values. The cultural heritage can in such a way help in forming democratic citizens. However, the level of successfulness in promoting democratic values depends on how well the

work is integrated with important local issues, which further underlines the significance of building the project together with those it involves; bottom-up instead of top-down.

## 6. References

Anderson, B. (1991). *Den föreställda gemenskapen: reflexioner kring nationalismens ursprung och spridning*. Göteborg: Daidalos.

Aronsson, P. (ed.) (2009). *Platser för en bättre värld: Auschwitz, Ruhr och röda stugor*. Lund: Nordic Academic Press.

Aronsson, P. (2011). Explaining National Museums: Exploring comparative approaches to the study of national museums. In: Knell, Simon J. (ed.) *National museums: new studies from around the world*. Abingdon : Routledge. Pp. 29-54.

Ashworth, G. J., Graham, B. J. & Tunbridge, J. E. (2007). *Pluralising pasts: heritage, identity and place in multicultural societies*. London: Pluto Press

Bakker, K., A., & Müller, L. (2010). Intangible Heritage and Community Identity in Post-Apartheid South Africa. In: *Museum International*. No. 245–246 (Vol. 62, No. 1–2, 2010). Pp. 48-56.

Balibar, É. (2002). Nationsformen: Historia och ideology. In: Étiene B. & Immanuel W. (red.) *Ras, Nation, Klass*, Boförlaget Daidalos AB, Uddevalla.

Council of Europe. (2011). *The Role of Cultural Heritage in Conflict Prevention, Transformation, Resolution and Post-Conflict Action: The Council of Europe Approach*. AT(2010)397 rev.1.

Filippucci, P. (2012). Archaeology and the anthropology of memory: Takes on the recent past. In: Duncan, G. & Thomas, Y. (eds.) *Archaeology and anthropology: understanding similarities, exploring differences*. Oxford: Oxbow Books Ltd. Pp. 69-83.

Glendinning, W. (2011). Storytelling and Dialogue as Part of the Irish Peace Process. In: Gustafsson, B., Holtorf, C., Westergren, E.(eds.) *Museum International Volume 63, Issue 1-2*. Pp. 102-108.

Gustafsson, B. (2011). The Meaning of Places through Stories: A Pedagogical Perspective. *In: Gustafsson, B., Holtorf, C., Westergren, E.(eds.) Museum International Volume 63, Issue 1-2.* Pp. 63-69.

Harrison, R, (ed.) (2010). *Understanding the politics of heritage.* Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Hastrup, K. (2010). *Kultur- Den flexibla gemenskapen.* Lund: Studentlitteratur.

Holtorf, C. (2011). The Changing Contribution of Cultural Heritage to Society. *In: Gustafsson, B., Holtorf, C., Westergren, E. (eds.) Museum International Volume 63, Issue 1-2.* Pp. 8-16.

Hunner, J., Westergren, E. (2011). Engaging the Present through the Past. *In: Gustafsson, B., Holtorf, C., Westergren, E. (eds.) Museum International Volume 63, Issue 1-2.* Pp. 119-129.

Kutma, K. (2012). Contested Memory and Re-configured Master Narratives: Museum Institution in Totalitarian Regimes. *In: Poulot, P., Guiral, J. M. L., & Bodenstein, F. (eds.). National Museums and the Negotiation of Difficult Pasts. EuNaMus Report No. 8.* Published by Linköping University Electronic Press. Pp. 79-90.

Kälvemark, T. (2007). Cultural Heritage for Peace and Reconciliation: An evaluation of Cultural Heritage without Borders (ChwB). Unpublished report available at <http://chwb.org>

Levin, M. (2010). Community Engagement with Heritage. *In: Svanberg, F. (ed.). The Museum as Forum and Actor.* The Museum of National Antiquities, Stockholm. Pp. 61-76.

Ljungman, C. & Taboroff, J. (2011). Evaluation of Cultural Heritage without Borders (2008–2011). Unpublished report available at <http://chwb.org>

Message, K. (2006). *New museums and the making of culture.* Berg Oxford.

Šebek, N. (2010). How Turkish is your Coffee. The SEE Joint History Project. *In: Svanberg, F.*

(ed.). *The Museum as Forum and Actor*. The Museum of National Antiquities, Stockholm. Pp. 115-124.

Ševčenko, L. (2010). Sites of Conscience: new approaches to conflicted memory. *In: Museum International*. No. 245–246 (Vol. 62, No. 1–2, 2010). Pp. 20-25.

Ševčenko, L. (2011). Sites of Conscience: Heritage of and for Human Rights. *In: Anheier, H. & Isar, Y. R. (ed.) Heritage, Memory and Identity*. Pp. 114-123.

Tunbridge, J. E. & Ashworth, G. J. (1996). *Dissonant heritage: the management of the past as a resource in conflict*. Wiley, Chichester.

Wertsch, J., Billingsley, D. M. (2011). The Role of Narratives in Commemoration: Remembering as Mediated Action. *In: Anheier, H. & Isar, Y. R. (eds.) Heritage, Memory and Identity*. Pp. 25-38.

Viejo-Rose, D. (2011a). Destruction and Reconstruction of Heritage: Impacts on Memory and Identity. *In: Anheier, H. & Isar, Y. R. (eds.) Heritage, Memory and Identity*. Pp. 53-69.

Viejo-Rose, D. (2011b). *Reconstructing Spain: cultural heritage and memory after Civil War*. Brighton: Sussex Academic.

Williams, P. (2012). Treading Difficult Ground: The Effort to Establish Russia's First National Gulag Museum. *In: Poulot, P., Guiral, J. M. L., & Bodenstein, F. (eds.) National Museums and the Negotiation of Difficult Pasts. EuNaMus Report No. 8*. Published by Linköping University Electronic Press. Pp. 111-121.

Wing, L. (2010). Dealing with the Past: shared and contested narratives in 'post-conflict' Northern Ireland. *In: Museum International*. No. 245–246 (Vol. 62, No. 1–2, 2010). Pp. 31-36.

***World Wide Web (Checked 08/05 2014)***

Adolfsson, V. (2014). <http://nyheter24.se/nyheter/politik/762081-sd-kraftsamlade-mot-moske-fick->

[ihop-28-underskrifter](#)

Bilefsky, D. (2007). Ney York Times.

[http://www.nytimes.com/2007/11/11/world/europe/11balkans.html?\\_r=0](http://www.nytimes.com/2007/11/11/world/europe/11balkans.html?_r=0)

The Faro Convention. (2005).

[http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/cultureheritage/heritage/Identities/Faro\\_en.asp](http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/cultureheritage/heritage/Identities/Faro_en.asp)

Guernica Peace Museum. (2014).

[http://www.museodelapaz.org/en/expo\\_des\\_en.php?idexposicion=2](http://www.museodelapaz.org/en/expo_des_en.php?idexposicion=2)

Healing Trough Remembering. (2014). [www.healingthroughremembering.org](http://www.healingthroughremembering.org)

Sites of Conscience. (2014). <http://www.sitesofconscience.org>

Sverige Demokraterna. (2014). <https://sverigedemokraterna.se/var-politik/religionen/>

## Appendix - List of projects

I will here list some of the relevant projects concerning the role of the cultural heritage in conflict resolution. However, the list is by no means a complete overview of the field. When presenting the projects I mainly try to use the official description of them found on their websites or in publications.

### 1. Research projects

#### CRIC

<http://www.cric.arch.cam.ac.uk/about-the-project.html>

CRIC stands for Cultural Heritage and the Reconstruction of Identities after Conflict and is a multi-disciplinary project which investigates the relationship between cultural heritage, conflict and identity.

The project involves collaboration between nine European universities and NGOs researching case studies in [Spain](#), [France](#), [Cyprus](#), [Bosnia](#) and [Germany](#), which represent different types of conflict dating from World War I to the present day.

Across Europe, national and regional identities are in the process of being formed and are influenced by local and regional histories. There are many ways of approaching and studying these relationships; this project examines how the cultural heritage, both material and symbolic, is involved in the reconstruction of identities following conflict.

History records many instances of damage and destruction of cultural heritage in times of conflict. Much of this damage is accidental, even inevitable; but we have also witnessed a striking increase in the deliberate targeted destruction of the cultural heritage of others, a destruction that apparently aims to inflict moral and psychological damage. Recent conflicts in Europe, as well as abroad, have propelled this issue to the foreground.

The CRIC project looks, therefore, at two key questions:

- 1). What conditions and ideologies inspire the destruction of cultural heritage?
- 2). What consequences arise at local, national, and regional levels as a result of the destruction and subsequent reconstruction of that heritage?

#### *References used:*

Filippucci, P. (2012). Archaeology and the anthropology of memory: Takes on the recent past. *In: Duncan, G. & Thomas, Y. (eds.) Archaeology and anthropology: understanding similarities, exploring differences.* Oxford: Oxbow Books Ltd. Pp. 69-83.

Viejo-Rose, D. (2011a). Destruction and Reconstruction of Heritage: Impacts on Memory and Identity. *In: Anheier, H. & Isar, Y. R. (eds.) Heritage, Memory and Identity.* Pp. 53-69.

Viejo-Rose, D. (2011b). *Reconstructing Spain: cultural heritage and memory after Civil War*. Brighton: Sussex Academic.

## **EuNaMus**

<http://www.eunamus.eu>

A three year research project concerning the role of National Museums in Europe. Many universities in Europe contributed to the project, and the results are published and downloadable from their website.

*The overarching objectives of EuNaMus were:*

To conduct a comparative study of the formation of national museums in Europe and deliver a rich picture of national museums in all their social, political, and intellectual complicity.

To reveal the historiographic practices that underlie national museums' uses of the past and to understand how they mould collective sensibilities, notions of community, citizenship, and boundaries of difference.

To examine the semiotics of national museum buildings and gathered material heritage and make visible the material culture that unites and defines European sensibilities and values.

To interrogate the policy making and policy implementation actions of national museums and understand how these institutions have acquired their roles as social agents.

To locate the European citizen as an active participant in the making of national museums and understand the reception of national museums.

To facilitate for national museums to act as arenas for dialogue between European citizens about what it means to belong to a nation and to Europe.

*References used:*

Kutma, K. (2012). Contested Memory and Re-configured Master Narratives: Museum Institution in Totalitarian Regimes. In: Poulot, P., Guiral, J. M. L., & Bodenstein, F. (eds.). *National Museums and the Negotiation of Difficult Pasts. EuNaMus Report No. 8*. Published by Linköping University Electronic Press. Pp. 79-90.

Williams, P. (2012). Treading Difficult Ground: The Effort to Establish Russia's First National Gulag Museum. In: Poulot, P., Guiral, J. M. L., & Bodenstein, F. (eds.). *National Museums and the Negotiation of Difficult Pasts. EuNaMus Report No. 8*. Published by Linköping University Electronic Press. Pp. 111-121.

## **Visnja Kistic – Governing Dissonant Heritage (PhD)**

*PhD Abstract:*



*Governing dissonant heritage – promises and realities of existing cultural policy tools* is the title of my current research which incorporates insights from the fields of museology, heritage studies, cultural memory studies into cultural policy studies in order to analyze whether and how cultural policy measures can govern dissonant heritage for peace building. It aims to 1) map and highlight main conceptual shifts in understanding dissonant heritage by heritage and cultural memory studies and ways in which they are reflected in international policy documents so as to create a new conceptual trans-disciplinary framework for policy evaluation; 2) to analyze and evaluate the impact of selected contemporary initiatives which try to manage dissonant heritage in Southeast Europe by using different tools and principles and by engaging different actors; 3) and to make recommendations for cultural policy tools aimed at improving the governance of dissonant heritage as a peace building resource.

## **2. Projects/organisations with global scale**

### **Alliance for Historical Dialogue and Accountability**

<http://hrcolumbia.org/ahda/>

Based at Columbia University's Institute for the Study of Human Rights (ISHR), the Alliance for Historical Dialogue and Accountability (AHDA) is a convening body which aims to facilitate exchange among scholars, advocates, and organizations dedicated to historical dialogue and accountability.

AHDA brings together academics, representatives of civil society organization, journalists, educators and artists as well as policy makers who all pursue historical dialogue in conflict, post-conflict and post-dictatorial societies. They address the political ramifications of the historical legacy of conflicts, as well as the role and impact of the memory of past violence on contemporary politics, society and culture. These ramifications often continue to haunt contemporary societies and the memories that shape the identities of protagonists in numerous conflict and post-conflict countries around the world. AHDA builds networks and facilitates comparative as well as interdisciplinary dialogue among its members.

### **Bridging Ages**

<http://www.bridgingages.com>

Bridging Ages is an international organization focusing on local history, Sites and Stories, recreating the past in an educational setting. Bridging Ages believe that local communities could be developed using historical perspectives on current issues in society. Bridging Ages consist of people from schools, communities, museums, universities etc from more than 20 countries on four continents.

#### *References used:*

Hunner, J., Westergren, E. (2011). Engaging the Present through the Past. *In: Gustafsson, B., Holtorf, C., Westergren, E. (eds.) Museum International Volume 63, Issue 1-2.* Pp. 119-129.

## **Cultural Heritage Without Borders**

<http://chwb.org>

The foundation Cultural Heritage without Borders (CHwB) is an independent Swedish non-governmental organisation dedicated to rescuing and preserving tangible and intangible cultural heritage affected by conflict, neglect or human and natural disasters.

We see our work as a vital contribution to building democracy and supporting human rights. CHwB is neutral when it comes to conflicting parties, but not to the rights of all people to cultural heritage – now and in the future.

CHwB works with cultural heritage as an active force in reconciliation, peace building and social and economic development by creating capacity, awareness and opportunities for preserving and rescuing cultural heritage in societies affected by conflict, neglect or human and natural disasters. CHwB is committed to equality, non-discrimination, participation, accountability and transparency.

Vision: Everyone's right to enjoy, have access to and participate in cultural heritage.

Mission: Our mission is to promote cultural heritage as both a right in itself and a resource. CHwB works with civil society and institutions at all levels to strengthen peace-building, sustainable socio-economic and democratic development and the realisation of human rights.

### *References used:*

Kälvemark, T. (2007). Cultural Heritage for Peace and Reconciliation: An evaluation of Cultural Heritage without Borders (ChwB). Unpublished report available at <http://chwb.org>

Ljungman, C. & Taboroff, J. (2011). Evaluation of Cultural Heritage without Borders (2008–2011). Unpublished report available at <http://chwb.org>

## **The Dialogues on Historical Justice and Memory (Part of AHDA and Historical Justice and Memory Research Network)**

<http://historicaldialogues.org>

The Dialogues on Historical Justice and Memory Research Network provides a platform for researchers and activists working on issues of historical dialogue, historical and transitional justice, and public and social memory. The website provides information and resources to encourage innovative interdisciplinary, transnational and comparative research. It is housed at the Institute for Study of Human Rights at Columbia University, New York City.

## **Sites of Conscience**

<http://www.sitesofconscience.org>

SoC is a global organization that started in 1999 when directors of nine historical sites in different settings came together to explore a shared question, how could heritage sites promote human rights.

### *Goals for SOC*

- ▲ Interpreting history through sites.
- ▲ Stimulating dialogue on pressing social issues, and promoting democratic and humanitarian values.
- ▲ Sharing opportunities for public involvement in the issues raised at the sites.

### *References used:*

Ševčenko, L. (2010). Sites of Conscience: new approaches to conflicted memory. *In: Museum International*. No. 245–246 (Vol. 62, No. 1–2, 2010). Pp. 20-25.

Ševčenko, L. (2011). Sites of Conscience: Heritage of and for Human Rights. *In: Anheier, H. & Isar, Y. R. (ed.) Heritage, Memory and Identity*. Pp. 114-123.

### **International Network of Museums of Peace - INMP**

<http://inmp.net>

The International Network of Museums for Peace (INMP) is a non-profit organisation, established since 1992 and associated with the United Nations Department of Public Information in New York, that aims to build a global culture of peace by strengthening the work of museums for peace.

The International Network of Museums for Peace is a worldwide network of peace museums that share in the same desire to build a global culture of peace. It also includes peace gardens and other peace related sites, centres and institutions which are involved in public peace education through exhibitions, documentation and similar activities

The objective of the INMP is to contribute to world peace by means of promoting and enhancing the work of museums for peace. The network aims to reach this objective by organising international conferences and other activities, publications (books, articles and newsletters), its website and by creating links between peace museums, related institutions and individuals worldwide to encourage the exchange of information, material, exhibitions, set up joint exhibitions to spread know-how, etc. It also intends to encourage the creation of more peace museums in other parts of the world. The INMP seeks to finance its goals with annual fees, donations, yields from activities and funding.

### **3. Projects of smaller/more regional scale**

#### **Art, Performance and Media in (Post-) Conflict Societies**

<http://www.qub.ac.uk/research-centres/iscts/InterdisciplinaryResearchGroups/ArtPerformanceandMediainPost-ConflictSocieties/>

A decade and a half after the signing of the Belfast/Good Friday Agreement, debate in Northern Ireland remains increasingly focused on what have become known as ‘legacy issues’ – particularly the ways in which experiences of conflict, violence, injustice, and division are articulated and received within the public and private realms. Art, performance, and media play key roles in (a)

narrating and disseminating those experiences through performative, visual, and literary practices, and (b) institutional, personal, and artistic processes of collating those experiences. Story

Telling and archiving have crucial functions in processes of conflict transformation and the pursuit of social justice on an international scale. These processes connect Northern Ireland with other post-conflict societies, such as Chile, Brazil, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Rwanda, and South Africa. The group is currently organizing a series of monthly seminars among group members with the aim of introducing members to one another's research. These take the format of short presentations, pitches, and/or provocations by group members, emphasizing the interdisciplinary dimensions of their work, followed by discussion and debate. We have established and continue to maintain an interactive calendar of events with the objective of encouraging interdisciplinary engagement along with raising awareness of activities across the group and beyond.

### **Diversity Challenges**

<http://www.diversity-challenges.com/home-page/>

Diversity Challenges was founded in 2001 to facilitate change in a number of Cultural groups in Ireland.

Vision: A society in which people understand, and take responsibility for, the shared and distinctive traditions of all communities.

Mission: To assist culturally specific groups in integrating community relations principles and considerations within all aspects of their work.

Target key culturally specific groups within Ireland, with greatest impact on community life.  
Identify influential individuals within each organisation who are driving change (or wish to drive change) towards a fuller and more constructive role in a diverse society.  
Support the individuals through consultancy, coaching, training, networking and practical assistance to develop and implement change strategies within their organisations.  
Provide training, e.g. community development, good relations, essential skills, drama, storytelling, musical skills  
Undertake community audits and local research projects for the benefit of local groups  
Facilitate the development of family friendly events at parades and demonstrations leading to change in the nature of parading and reducing tension.  
Help society to deal with the past conflict to remember and change to a more peaceful time when we are at peace with ourselves.  
Use the experience gained in the project to develop and publish good practice models for international circulation  
Provide consultancy and training support on the use of the best practice models to agencies in other countries facing similar challenges.

### *References used:*

Glendinning, W. (2011). Storytelling and Dialogue as Part of the Irish Peace Process. *In:* Gustafsson, B., Holtorf, C., Westergren, E.(eds.) *Museum International Volume 63, Issue 1-2*. Pp. 102-108.

## **Facing the Past – Shaping the Future**

<http://facingthepastshapingthefuture.com>

The decade 2012-2022 marks the centenary of several events, populist interpretations of which still continue to influence identities cultures and divisions today in Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland. The concern is that simplistic interpretations and inappropriate commemorations of such events serve to perpetuate community divisions. The experience of past conflicts and the potential for inappropriate commemoration of populist interpretations add a moral and ethical imperative for schools and society to engage objectively with these issues.

This web resource provides Primary and Post Primary teachers and schools with resources , guidance, and strategies to encourage active pupil investigation of significant events 100 years ago.

Teachers will come to the resource with different experience and may choose to focus on particular sections.

## **Healing Through Remembering**

<http://www.healingthroughremembering.org>

Healing Through Remembering is an independent initiative made up of a diverse membership with different political perspectives working on a common goal of how to deal with the legacy of the past as it relates to the conflict in and about Northern Ireland. This is achieved through various projects, for example Conversational Workshops.

### *References used*

Wing, L. (2010). Dealing with the Past: shared and contested narratives in ‘post-conflict’ Northern Ireland . *In: Museum International*. No. 245–246 (Vol. 62, No. 1–2, 2010). Pp. 31-36.

## **History Education Beyond Borders – How Can We Share Our Cultural Heritage?**

<http://ecflabs.org/grants/projects/sb/history-education-beyond-borders---how-can-we-share-our-cultural-heritage>

### *What does the project involve*

- Active participation in the 21st EUROCLIO Annual Conference and Professional Training and Development Course “History Education Beyond Borders: How Can We Share Our Cultural Heritage?” on 31 March – 6 April 2014 in Ohrid, Macedonia. This event is a six-day intensive training and unique regional and international gathering on history, cultural heritage and remembrance and their role to foster reconciliation, peace and stability.
- Networking and exchange of knowledge and good practices with over 150 history, heritage, and citizenship educators as well as culture and education workers, policy makers, and other experts from over 30 countries.
- Contributing perspectives and expertise throughout the conference programme. Giving and receiving feedback on ongoing projects, initiatives and ideas in various cultural fields.
- Exploration of future cooperation opportunities with regional and international partners.

## **Joint History Project**

<http://www.cdsee.org/projects/jhp>

The Joint History Project (JHP) is an ongoing, social, political and educational initiative that begun under the auspices of the CDRSEE in 1999, aiming at an informed, significant and realistic change in historical research and education in all countries of Southeast Europe. The overarching goal is to give teachers, students and everyday citizens a voice for influencing public sector reform.

The objectives are to encourage debate, celebrate diversity and recognise shared suffering and achievements through a participative approach to history teaching, in order for students and teachers to develop the understanding and skills needed for sustainable peace and a democratic future. In the long term, the JHP aims to revise ethnocentric school history teaching by avoiding stereotypes, by identifying attitudes that encourage conflict, by suggesting alternative teaching methods and by promoting the idea of multiple interpretations of one event.

The objectives of the project are achieved through the production of a set of alternative history-teaching education materials currently available in eight languages– designed and written by prominent experts from all over the region – along with continuous teacher training, outreach and media work.

Project concerning 11 states of south eastern Europe, started in 1998. Directed at teachers to develop the understanding and skills needed for sustainable peace, and a democratic future. The Goal of the project has been to encourage debate, celebrate diversity and recognize suffering and achievements through a multi-perspective and participate approach to history teaching.

Numerous new school books have been developed within the project, and over 700 teachers have so far been trained in 28 workshops.

### *References used:*

Šebek, N. (2010). How Turkish is your Coffee. The SEE Joint History Project. *In: Svanberg, F. (ed.). The Museum as Forum and Actor.* The Museum of National Antiquities, Stockholm. Pp. 115-124.

## **PUSH – Promoting dialogue and cultural Understanding of our Shared Heritage**

<http://pushproject.bezalel.ac.il/index.html>

PUSH is a cooperative project between Al Quds University and Bezalel Aacdemy of Art and Design, (Jerusalem) as well as the NGO, The Jordan Society for Sustainable Development.

Utilizing the UNESCO recommendations for academic networking and dialogue to foster mutual respect for cultural and natural heritage, PUSH works to break down cultural prejudices by building greater understanding of the region's shared heritage as a means to respect and appreciate the region's diverse cultures and advance peace in the region. Furthermore, by identifying important sites of natural and cultural heritage, PUSH brings international attention to the rich heritage of the region in need of preservation. The PUSH project is not without obstacles. Developing mutual respect for the cultural heritage of the 'other' in the midst of conflict is not easy. There is an

undeniable need for increased dialogue and tri-lateral coordination concerning the shared heritage of this important region.

### **Shikaya – Facing the Past**

<http://shikaya.org>

Shikaya is a non-profit civil society organisation that recognises the crucial role that teachers can play in deepening and strengthening South Africa's democracy. As such, Shikaya supports the personal and professional development of teachers to create a South Africa in which young people in schools are inspired and supported to become responsible citizens and future in our democracy, valuing diversity, human rights and peace.

Since 2005, Shikaya has been working with and supporting over 3 000 teachers and education department officials across South Africa through various programmes and partnerships.

#### **4. Significant Anthologies**

Anheier, H. K. & Isar, Y. R. (eds.) (2011). *Heritage, memory & identity*. London: Sage.

Museum International. (2010). No. 245–246 (Vol. 62, No. 1–2).

Svanberg, F. (ed.) (2010). *The museum as forum and actor*. Stockholm: The Museum of National Antiquities.

Gustafsson, B., Holtorf, C., Westergren, E. (eds.) (2011). *The Social Benefits of Heritage*. *Museum International* 63 (1-2), no. 249/250.

Poulot, P., Guiral, J. M. L., & Bodenstern, F. (eds.) (2012). *National Museums and the Negotiation of Difficult Pasts*. *EuNaMus Report No. 8*. Published by Linköping University Electronic Press.