



Dissonant Heritage and War
Conservation and Communication
of a Difficult Legacy

Co.Co.War Glossary

Dissonant Heritage concepts and terms



Finanziato
dall'Unione europea
NextGenerationEU



Ministero
dell'Università
e della Ricerca



Italiadomani
PIANO NAZIONALE
DI RIPRESA E RESILIENZA



ALMA MATER STUDIORUM
UNIVERSITÀ
DI BOLOGNA



UNIVERSITÀ
POLITECNICA
DELLE MARCHE



Politecnico
di Torino

Dipartimento
di Architettura e Design



Co.Co.War

Glossary

Dissonant Heritage concepts and terms



Former House of the Fascist Party, Predappio, (Forlì, Italy), 2025



ALMA MATER STUDIORUM
UNIVERSITÀ
DI BOLOGNA



UNIVERSITÀ
POLITECNICA
DELLE MARCHE



Politecnico
di Torino
Dipartimento
di Architettura e Design





Dissonant Heritage and War
Conservation and Communication
of a Difficult Legacy

Co.Co.War - Glossary

Dissonant Heritage concepts and terms

Authoring research unit:

Università Politecnica delle Marche

Dipartimento di Ingegneria Civile , Edile e Architettura - DICEA

Chiara Mariotti

Giorgio Danesi

Alessandro Ceppetelli

First Edition: February 2026

DOI <https://doi.org/10.6092/unibo/amsacta/8910>

Project website: <https://cocowar.com>

This open-access volume is an outcome of the PRIN project “Co.Co.War - Dissonant Heritage and War. Conservation and Communication of a Difficult Legacy” (MUR 2022YHNX9M_001 - CUP J53D23013690006), funded by the Italian Ministry of University and Research and coordinated by Prof. Leila Signorelli. Other project outcomes include: “Co.Co.War - Atlas. Mapping Dissonant Heritage”; “Co.Co.War - Community Toolkit. Understanding the (Dis)Value”; “Co.Co.War - Handbook. Managing Dissonant Heritage”.



This volume is published under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0

International License (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0) <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>



Finanziato
dall'Unione europea
NextGenerationEU



Italiadomani
PIANO NAZIONALE
DI RIPRESA E RESILIENZA



Ministero
dell'Università
e della Ricerca



ALMA MATER STUDIORUM
UNIVERSITÀ
DI BOLOGNA



UNIVERSITÀ
POLITECNICA
DELLE MARCHE



Politecnico
di Torino
Dipartimento
di Architettura e Design



“Co.Co.War — Dissonant Heritage and War. Conservation and Communication of a Difficult Legacy” is a National Research Program (Progetto di Rilevante Interesse Nazionale — PRIN) funded by the Italian Ministry of University and Research. The project is carried out by an interdisciplinary network involving three Italian universities: Alma Mater Studiorum — Università di Bologna, Università Politecnica delle Marche, and Politecnico di Torino. The project investigates the phenomenon of dissonant heritage in contexts shaped by war, conflict, and contested pasts, focusing on architectural and cultural assets whose meanings are unstable, conflictual, or socially disputed, and whose interpretation, conservation, and communication are often exposed to ethical, political, and social tensions. Co.Co.War aims to develop innovative, value-based, and critically grounded approaches to the study and management of this complex heritage by integrating conservation practices with interpretative and communicative strategies. Rather than seeking to resolve dissonance or to stabilize heritage meanings, the project acknowledges conflict, ambiguity, and plurality as structural conditions of these sites. Through comparative analysis, methodological experimentation, and interdisciplinary collaboration, Co.Co.War explores how dissonant heritage can be responsibly investigated, preserved, and communicated, while addressing emerging risks such as interpretative conflicts, polarized narratives, and the instrumentalization of memory.

This publication forms part of an interconnected set of research outputs produced within the Co.Co.War project. It is intended to be considered together with: “Co.Co.War - Atlas. Mapping Dissonant Heritage” (<https://doi.org/10.6092/unibo/amsacta/8909>); “Co.Co.War - Community Toolkit. Understanding the (Dis)Value” (<https://doi.org/10.6092/unibo/amsacta/8911>); and “Co.Co.War - Handbook. Managing Dissonant Heritage” (<https://doi.org/10.6092/unibo/amsacta/8912>).

Co.Co.War - Glossary

Preface

The Co.Co.War Glossary is conceived as a tool to articulate and elucidate a compact set of concepts and terms that shape the project's theoretical and operational framework. It serves as a means to clarify the ontological aspects of, and facilitate discussion on, dissonant heritage, grounded in a shared conceptual language for both project partners and the readers of the project outcomes.

The glossary is not intended to be exhaustive, nor to constitute a comprehensive collection of all relevant terminology, as excellent resources already exist, and it does not introduce neologisms. Rather, it brings together well-established concepts and terms in the field of heritage conservation whose meanings have evolved, become layered over time, and, in some cases, have been reformulated, thereby significantly influencing guidelines and approaches to the safeguarding of cultural heritage and related challenges. It is therefore imperative that this terminology is employed in a clear and consistent manner throughout the project.

Selected definitions are primarily drawn from authoritative reference works (Charters, Recommendations, Declarations, Manuals, Glossaries) published by European and international cultural heritage organizations, institutions, and agencies (e.g., UNESCO, ICOMOS, ICCROM, IUCN, UNDRR, the Council of Europe, and the Getty Research Institute). Where no EU or equivalent definition exists, definitions are complemented by studies considered milestones in Dissonant Heritage research, based on academic publications and reputable online sources, and conducted by both individual scholars and international bodies (e.g., Urban Agenda for the EU — Action Group on Dissonant Heritage, UNA Europa, Contested Histories).

As is typical of a glossary, each term is presented in alphabetical order and associated with one or more definitions, according to its complexity and the range of references from which it is sourced. Definitions are listed predominantly in chronological order, with some variations reflecting additional nuances of the term, which are nevertheless cross-referenced where relevant. The "Related sources" field provides further references addressing closely related concepts. Furthermore, theoretical definitions or notes marked with the Co.Co.War logo indicate how specific terms are conceptualized and operationalized within the project's research and field activities.

These notes reflect both the Co.Co.War project's perspective and its contribution to contemporary scientific research on dissonant heritage.

The selection of terms encompasses the full scope of the project across its thematic areas. The core entries address *Dissonance* and the taxonomy of dissonance as applied to cultural heritage (*Dissonant Heritage*, *Heritage Dissonance*, *Undesirable Heritage*, *Difficult Heritage*, *Contested Heritage*, etc.), alongside their triggering causes, with specific regard to *War* and, more broadly, to *Conflict* — both armed and interpretative. From this nucleus, the glossary extends to the risk-related lexicon required to address dissonance as a risk factor (*Risk*, *Vulnerability*, *Exposure*, *Hazard*, etc.), as well as to key terms within the heritage vocabulary including *Attributes*, *Authenticity*, *Identity*, *Significance*, *Values* and to concepts pertaining to the sphere of heritage *Perception*, *Interpretation*, *Protection*, *Prevention*, *Conservation*, *Restoration* and related practices. A further set of terms is included for consideration, offering a more detailed exploration of the challenges posed by dissonance in contemporary society; these pertain to *Memory*, *Negotiation*, *Reconciliation*, and *Heritage Discourse*.

The intention is twofold: firstly, to anchor Co.Co.War within a shared international terminology; secondly, to make the project's interpretative stance explicit, thereby contributing to academic debate providing guidance for researchers, professionals, policymakers, and communities dealing with challenging heritage.

**Please note that all links to references in the Glossary were last verified during the most recent online access in January 2026.*

INDEX

- / Attributes
- / Authenticity
- / Capacity
- / Communication
- / Community (Heritage Communities)
- / Conflict
- / Conservation
- / Discourse (Heritage Discourse)
- / Dissonance (Dissonant Heritage)
- / Exposure
- / Hazard
- / Heritage
- / Identity
- / Impact (Direct - Indirect)
- / Intangible (Cultural Heritage)
- / Integrity
- / Interpretation
- / Management

/ Memory
/ Multiperspectivity
/ Negotiation
/ Perception
/ Preservation
/ Prevention
/ Protection
/ Reconciliation
/ Resilience
/ Restoration
/ Risk
/ Significance
/ Stakeholder
/ Strategies
/ Tangible (Cultural Heritage)
/ Value (Dis-value)
/ Vulnerability
/ War

/ATTRIBUTES

/ ATTRIBUTES

“Attributes are the elements of a heritage place which convey its heritage values and enable an understanding of those values. They can be physical structures, material fabric and other tangible features, but can also be intangible aspects such processes, social arrangements or cultural practices, as well as associations and relationships which are reflected in physical elements of the place. For cultural heritage places, they can be buildings or other built structures and their forms, materials, design, uses and functions but also urban layouts, agricultural processes, religious ceremonies, building techniques, visual relationships and spiritual connections. For natural properties, they can be specific landscape features, areas of habitat, flagship species, aspects relating to environmental quality (such as intactness, high/pristine environmental quality), scale and naturalness of habitats, and size and viability of wildlife populations. Attributes, and the interactions between them, should be the focus of protection, conservation and management measures. The term ‘attributes’ is particularly used for World Heritage properties and a clear understanding of the attributes that convey their Outstanding Universal Value is critical for their long-term protection. The spatial distribution of those attributes and respective protection requirements should inform the boundary of the property and other management measures.”

[UNESCO, ICCROM, ICOMOS, IUCN. 2023. *Enhancing Our Heritage Toolkit 2.0: Assessing Management Effectiveness of World Heritage Properties and Other Heritage Places*. UNESCO. Paris, France.](#)



Attributes are the tangible and intangible aspects of a heritage site that convey or express its complex system of values, both positive and negative.

[Controversial attributes]

Controversial attributes are tangible or intangible aspects of a heritage asset that evoke uncomfortable memories or divisive elements of the past, with the potential to overshadow or call into question its relevance, significance, or benefit

to contemporary society. Consequently, they may contribute to or amplify the asset's dissonance, triggering processes of disinheritance. Examples include a site's geographical proximity to, or socio-cultural associations with, a conflict area; controversial forms of ownership or management; inadequate or ineffective legal or protective frameworks; specific architectural features such as symbols or decorations; politically exposed architects, artists, institutions or clients; problematic past or present uses, or a poor state of conservation when this contributes to the site's marginalization or contested perception. Controversial attributes — and attributes more broadly — are inseparable from their interaction with people and communities, strongly shaping the interpretation of heritage, its values and disvalues, and related management processes, while influencing legitimization or delegitimization over its preservation and transmission to future generations. The identification of the 'controversial attributes' of a heritage asset represents a crucial stage in the Co.Co.War methodology for managing dissonant heritage: the *Understanding* phase, which builds on a more objective contextualization of the place — particularly from a historical perspective — while introducing a focused interpretative lens through which dissonance is investigated (Co.Co.War Handbook > four-phase management process). The aim is not merely to record the main characteristics of the asset, but to understand which attributes may become socially, politically, or culturally contentious, and therefore require particular attention in any future strategy of conservation, communication, or reuse. This analysis requires careful examination of the conflict underlying the dissonance to avoid reductive interpretations, while ensuring that other positive attributes are not diminished. At the same time, community perceptions of controversial attributes should be explored through tools that assess the scope, depth, and historical layering of dissonance, supported by structured engagement strategies that foster dialogue, trust, and responsible action, enabling professionals to address heritage while acknowledging its complex perceptual dimensions (Co. Co.War Community Toolkit).

➤ Refer also to **Co.Co.War Handbook - Managing Dissonant Heritage**

➤ Refer also to **Co.Co.War Community Toolkit - Understanding (dis)value**

[Co.Co.War](#)

Related sources:

“Attributes are aspects of a property which are associated with or express the Outstanding Universal Value. Attributes can be tangible or intangible. The Operational Guidelines indicate a range of types of attribute which might convey Outstanding Universal Value, including: form and design; materials and substance; use and function; traditions, techniques and management systems; location and setting; language, and other forms of intangible heritage; and spirit and feeling. This list is for guidance. It is essential that the attributes identified for a property should flow from the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value and the justification for the criteria. Attributes must be identified as they are vital to understanding authenticity and integrity, and are the focus of protection, conservation and management. For natural properties, it is more common to speak of ‘features’, although the word attributes is sometimes used. Examples of attributes for natural properties could include: visual or aesthetic significance; scale of the extent of physical features or natural habitats; intactness of physical or ecological processes; naturalness, and intactness of natural systems; viability; rarity.”

[UNESCO, ICCROM, ICOMOS, IUCN. 2011. *The World Heritage Resource Manual Preparing World Heritage Nominations* \(2nd edition\). UNESCO. Paris, France.](#)

/AUTHENTICITY

/ AUTHENTICITY

“Values and authenticity

[10] Authenticity, considered in this way and affirmed in the Charter of Venice, appears as the essential qualifying factor concerning values. The understanding of authenticity plays a fundamental role in all scientific studies of the cultural heritage, in conservation and restoration planning, as well as within the inscription procedures used for the World Heritage Convention and other cultural heritage inventories.

[11] All judgements about values attributed to cultural properties as well as the credibility of related information sources may differ from culture to culture, and even within the same culture. It is thus not possible to base judgements of values and authenticity within fixed criteria. On the contrary, the respect due to all cultures requires that heritage properties must be considered and judged within the cultural contexts to which they belong.

[12] Therefore, it is of the highest importance and urgency that, within each culture, recognition be accorded to the specific nature of its heritage values and the credibility and truthfulness of related information sources.

[13] Depending on the nature of the cultural heritage, its cultural context, and its evolution through time, authenticity judgements may be linked to the worth of a great variety of sources of information. Aspects of the sources may include form and design, materials and substance, use and function, traditions and techniques, location and setting, and spirit and feeling, and other internal and external factors. The use of these sources permits elaboration of the specific artistic, historic, social, and scientific dimensions of the cultural heritage being examined.”

[UNESCO, ICCROM and ICOMOS. 1994. *Nara Document on Authenticity*. Experts meeting \(1-6 November 1994\). Nara, Japan.](#)

“[1] Authenticity and Identity

The authenticity of our cultural heritage is directly related to our cultural identity. [...]. The authenticity of our cultural resources lies in the identification, evaluation and interpretation of their true values as perceived by our ancestors in the past and by ourselves now as an evolving and diverse community. As such, the Americas must recognize the values of the majorities and the minorities without imposing a hierarchical predominance of any one culture and its values over those of others. The comprehensive cultural value of our heritage can be understood only through an objective study of history, the material elements inherent in the tangible heritage, and a deep understanding of the intangible traditions associated with the tangible patrimony. When taking into account the value of heritage sites as related to cultural identity, the Americas face the global problem of cultural homogenization, which tends to dilute and erase local values in favor of those that are being advanced universally, often as stereotyped illusions with commercial ends. This weakens the role of heritage sites. While we accept the importance of traditional values as an instrument in ethnic and national identity, we reject their use to promote exacerbated nationalism and other conflicting attitudes that would lead our continent away from mutual respect and a permanent peace.”

[ICOMOS. 1996. *The Declaration of San Antonio*. San Antonio, Texas, United States of America.](#)

See also “**Identity**”

“Authenticity means the sum of substantial, historically ascertained characteristics: from the original up to the current state, as an outcome of the various transformations that have occurred over time.”

[ICOMOS. 2000. *The Charter of Krakow 2000. Principles for Conservation and Restoration of Built Heritage*. Krakow, Poland.](#)

“Authenticity means the credibility or truthfulness of the surviving evidence and knowledge of the cultural heritage value of a place. Relevant evidence includes form and design, substance and fabric, technology and craftsmanship, location and surroundings, context and setting, use and function, traditions, spiritual essence, and sense of place, and includes tangible and intangible values. Assessment of authenticity is based on identification and analysis of relevant evidence and knowledge, and respect for its cultural context.”

[ICOMOS. 2010. ICOMOS New Zealand Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Heritage Value. New Zealand.](#)

“Authenticity: A culturally contingent quality associated with a heritage place, practice, or object that conveys cultural value; is recognized as a meaningful expression of an evolving cultural tradition; and/or evokes among individuals the social and emotional resonance of group identity.”

[Nara +20. 2014. Nara +20 on Heritage Practices, Cultural Values, and the Concept of Authenticity. 20th Anniversary of the Nara Document on Authenticity \(22-24 October 2014\). Nara, Japan.](#)

Related sources:

Authenticity in the Operational Guidelines since 1977

Operational Guidelines, 1977: “[9] In addition, the property should meet the test of authenticity in design, materials, workmanship and setting; authenticity does not limit consideration to original form and structure but includes all subsequent modifications and additions over the course of time, which in themselves possess artistic or historical values.”

Operational Guidelines, 1980: “[18] Each property nominated should therefore: a) [...] and b) meet the test of authenticity in design, materials, workmanship or setting (the Committee stressed that reconstruction is only acceptable if it is

carried out on the basis of complete and detailed documentation on the original and to no extent on conjecture).”

Operational Guidelines, 1994: “[24] Each property nominated should therefore: a) [...] and b) (i) meet the test of authenticity in design, materials, workmanship or setting and in the case of cultural landscapes their distinctive character and components (the Committee stressed that reconstruction is only acceptable if it is carried out on the basis of complete and detailed documentation on the original and to no extent on conjecture).”

Operational Guidelines, 2005: “[79] Properties nominated under criteria (i) to (vi) must meet the conditions of authenticity. Annex 4 which includes the Nara Document on Authenticity, provides a practical basis for examining the authenticity of such properties and is summarized below; [80] The ability to understand the value attributed to the heritage depends on the degree to which information sources about this value may be understood as credible or truthful. Knowledge and understanding of these sources of information, in relation to original and subsequent characteristics of the cultural heritage, and their meaning, are the requisite bases for assessing all aspects of authenticity; [...]; [82] Depending on the type of cultural heritage, and its cultural context, properties may be understood to meet the conditions of authenticity if their cultural value (as recognized in the nomination criteria proposed) are truthfully and credibly expressed through a variety of attributes including: form and design; materials and substance; use and function; traditions, techniques and management systems; location and setting; language, and other forms of intangible heritage; spirit and feeling; and other internal and external factors; [83] Attributes such as spirit and feeling do not lend themselves easily to practical applications of the conditions of authenticity, but nevertheless are important indicators of character and sense of place, for example, in communities maintaining tradition and cultural continuity. [...]”

Operational Guidelines, 2015: “[80] The ability to understand the value attributed to the heritage depends on the degree to which information sources about this value may be understood as credible or truthful. Knowledge and understanding of these sources of information, in relation to original and subsequent characteristics of the cultural heritage, and their meaning as accumulated over time, are the requisite bases for assessing all aspects of authenticity; [...]”

UNESCO, 2025. Reflection by the World Heritage Committee on the concept of authenticity — INF.9. Evolution of the definition of authenticity in the Operational Guidelines. UNESCO Headquarters. Paris, France.

/CAPACITY

/ CAPACITY

“The combination of all the strengths, attributes and resources available within an organization, community or society to manage and reduce disaster risks and strengthen resilience.

Annotation: Capacity may include infrastructure, institutions, human knowledge and skills, and collective attributes such as social relationships, leadership and management.”

[United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction \(UNDRR\). 2017. The Sendai Framework Terminology on Disaster Risk Reduction. “Capacity”.](#)



Capacity is the set of strengths, measures, resources, and skills available to a community, organization, or system to manage, reduce, or withstand risks associated with dissonance. When approaching dissonance as a potential risk, capacity is an integral component of the risk formula, following its adoption for the implementation of the Sendai Framework Disaster Risk Reduction in the early 21st century. Greater capacity lowers overall risk by reducing vulnerability and the probability that a hazard escalates into a disaster. For dissonant heritage, capacity can derive both from external resources, strategies, and interventions, and from intrinsic qualities of the site and the communities connected to it, including antifragility, thus helping to transform a divided and contested space into a liminal space for democracy, debate, inclusion, and negotiation with the past.

See also “**Risk**”

See also “**Resilience**”

➤ Refer also to **Co.Co.War Handbook - Managing Dissonant Heritage**

[Co.Co.War](#)

/COMMUNICATION

/ COMMUNICATION

“An interactive social process which involves the sharing of information, experiences, and cultures, both physically or electronically, and results in the mutual enhancement of all concerned.”

[UNESCO Thesaurus](#)

“A relationship between two or more persons or an inanimate medium and persons, involving the transfer of information (messages, ideas, knowledge, strategies, etc.). Communication may be verbal or non-verbal, direct/face-to-face or indirect/remote, and may involve a wide variety of channels and media.”

[CHARTER Glossary. 2024](#)

[Disinformation]

“False information that is given deliberately.”

[OXFORD Dictionary](#)

“False information spread deliberately in order to deceive people.”

[CAMBRIDGE Dictionary](#)

[Misinformation]

“The act of giving wrong information about something; the wrong information that is given.”

[OXFORD Dictionary](#)

“False information, given either by mistake or deliberately.”

[CAMBRIDGE Dictionary](#)



In heritage domain, communication encompasses the deliberate processes, strategies, and tools used to convey, interpret, and engage with heritage content. In the context of Dissonant Heritage, communication establishes a close and pivotal nexus with conservation — an aspect that has been less explored in scholarly research — and can potentially function both as an amplifier and a mediator of dissonance. On the one hand, communication can be manipulated, shaping narratives to obscure, distort, or instrumentalize heritage for political, ideological, or social purposes. On the other hand, communication can act as heritage-enabling process, creating spaces for understanding, negotiation, and re-signification of contested pasts.

[Manipulated Communication]

Manipulated Communication is associated with the broader concept of disinformation and refers to the deliberate use of heritage narratives, selective information, or symbolic representations to influence perception, memory, or public opinion in ways that may exacerbate dissonance, marginalize certain communities, or reinforce active or latent conflicts, potentially triggering hybrid forms of warfare. This may include propaganda, omission or denial of difficult histories, or distortion of meanings associated with controversial attributes. Such manipulation is not intended to ‘resolve trauma’ but to amplify or create dissonance; it is deliberately designed to provoke hostility, fuel revisionist and denialist agendas, and transform shared cultural assets into sources of social division. Within the Co.Co.War approach, manipulated communication is regarded as a factor that may threaten heritage by fostering attitudes opposed to its preservation — a concept, which is expressed by *Kriegwollen*. It should be carefully addressed in the initial phase of approaching DH — *Understanding* phase —, which examines not only how a site is represented across different media, but also whether such communication is biased, instrumentalized,

exclusionary, or shaped by authoritative discourses (Co.Co.War Handbook > four-phase management process). Manipulated communication is distinguished from general forms of misinformation, such as fake news — which may also distort the interpretive framework surrounding a site — and is increasingly amplified through generative AI and social media platforms, providing minimally filtered, high-visibility channels for rapid dissemination (e.g., Facebook, Twitter, TripAdvisor, Wikipedia).

[Communication as heritage-enabling process]

Communication as a heritage-enabling process encompasses approaches for a heritage site that promote respectful, non-polarizing strategies, attentive to social, political, cultural, and environmental risks, while fostering inclusive engagement, democratic dialogue, and multiperspective interpretation. In the Co.Co.War vision, heritage preservation supports the co-creation and circulation of conscious, plural narratives, addressing both the site and its re-signification, while leveraging digital tools and processes in a responsible way to manage complex, politically sensitive legacies. From this perspective, communication serves to reveal and share the layered meanings of heritage, complementing conservation strategies.

[Communication Plan]

A structured framework guiding the construction and circulation of information on heritage. In the Co.Co.War approach to DH, it is a strategic tool within the *Envisioning* phase, designed to provide both the interpretation of heritage meanings and the management of the site (Co.Co.War Handbook > four-phase management process). Its complexity relies on key priorities: respecting the community's readiness to engage with traumatic or sensitive memories; including all relevant perspectives in participatory processes; building coalitions and communication channels to mobilize awareness, visibility, and support through institutional networks and media; and applying the ATRIUM Cultural Routes strategies: use non-celebrative language, make dissonance explicit, emphasize heritage's present-day reuse, and convey dissonance through contrast. Communication is thus not supplementary to conservation, but a core condition for its long-term effectiveness and social legitimacy.

➤ Refer also to **Co.Co.War Handbook - Managing Dissonant Heritage**

➤ Refer also to **Co.Co.War Community Toolkit - Understanding (dis)value**

[Co.Co.War](#)

Related sources:

“[7] Considering that modern digital technologies (digital databases, websites) can be used efficiently and effectively at a low cost to develop multimedia inventories that integrate tangible and intangible elements of heritage, we strongly recommend their widespread use in order to better preserve, disseminate and promote heritage places and their spirit. These technologies facilitate the diversity and constant renewal of the documentation on the spirit of place.

[8] Recognizing that spirit of place is transmitted essentially by people, and that transmission is an important part of its conservation, we declare that it is through interactive communication and the participation of the concerned communities that the spirit of place is most efficiently safeguarded, used and enhanced. Communication is the best tool for keeping the spirit of place alive.”

[ICOMOS. 2000. Québec Declaration on the Preservation of the Spirit of Place. Adopted at Québec, Canada.](#)

“Hybrid warfare remains a contested concept. In a NATO context, the concept has been used to describe a combination of threats, including conventional forces, subversion of legitimate governments, cyber-attacks, and sophisticated disinformation and radicalization campaigns. Cultural Property here emerges as an element of a certain symbolic power that adversaries may ‘play’ to provoke new, or escalate existing, conflicts, or utilize for strategic communication purposes, including social media campaigns.”

[CHAC. 2017. NATO AND CULTURAL PROPERTY. Embracing New Challenges in the Era of Identity Wars. Report of the NATO Science for Peace and Security. CHAC — Cultural Heritage and Armed Conflict. Copenhagen, Denmark.](#)

“Good story-telling, using all opportunities offered by digital technologies, is key to conveying the history of the place and enhancing its heritage value.”

[Architects’ Council of Europe, EFFORT, ERIH, Europa Nostra, FRH, 2018. The Leeuwarden Declaration. Adaptive Re-Use of the Built Heritage: Preserving and Enhancing the Values of Our Built Heritage for Future Generations. Adopted on 23 November 2018 in Leeuwarden, The Netherland.](#)

“[26] The current Strategic Objectives (also referred to as “the 5 Cs”) are the following:

1. Strengthen the Credibility of the World Heritage List;
2. Ensure the effective Conservation of World Heritage Properties;
3. Promote the development of effective Capacity building in States Parties;
4. Increase public awareness, involvement and support for World Heritage through Communication;
5. Enhance the role of Communities in the implementation of the World Heritage Convention.”

[UNESCO. 2025. The Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention. UNESCO World Heritage Centre. Paris, France.](#)

[Disinformation as a threat to peace]

“Established by the European Parliamentary Research Service (EPRS) following the Normandy Peace Forum in 2019, the Normandy Peace Index has quickly become an important resource for policy-makers and civil society as an annual measurement of threats to peace globally.”

[...]

“The Normandy Index differs from other indices in that it adopts an approach tailored by and to EU action. It also defines conflict and the numerous stages

between perfect peace and total war as a product of factors linked to the main threats identified by the EU in its external action strategy. The EU Global Strategy identifies the following 11 threats as the main current challenges to peace and security: terrorism, hybrid threats, economic crises, energy insecurity, violent conflicts, climate change, cybersecurity, fragile states, trans-border crime, disinformation, weapons of mass destruction (WMDs).”

[EPRS. 2025. Mapping threats to peace and democracy worldwide - Normandy Index. European Parliamentary Research Service. Brussels, Belgium.](#)

[Uses of Language for DH]

“[...] the dissonance in the heritage ATRIUM deals with needs to be taken into account when promoting the cultural route, including also a careful use of language. [...] three communication strategies can be used to avoid the risk of celebrating such dissonant heritage: firstly by making dissonance explicit, secondly by emphasizing reuse in the present, and thirdly by conveying dissonance through contrast.”

*[Nauert, S. 2017. The Linguistic and Cultural Interpretation of Dissonant Heritage: the ATRIUM Cultural Route. *Almatourism - Journal of Tourism, Culture and Territorial Development*, 8\(15\), pp. 16-37.](#)*

/COMMUNITY
(HERITAGE
COMMUNITIES)

/ COMMUNITY (HERITAGE COMMUNITIES)

“Art 2: Definition

[b] a heritage community consists of people who value specific aspects of cultural heritage which they wish, within the framework of public action, to sustain and transmit to future generations.”

[The Faro Convention. 2005. Council of Europe Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society \(CETS No. 199\). Faro, Portugal.](#)

[Community identity]

“[a] Community identity is rarely uniform or static but is a living concept that is constantly evolving thanks to an interplay of past and present in the context of current geo-political circumstances. Around the world, contrasting — and often conflicting — community identities are expressed through (and can be shaped negatively or positively by) the range of activities and service provision offered at cultural heritage tourist destinations that are intended to take advantage of the economic, social and cultural benefits of tourism.”

[Community involvement]

“Community involvement with cultural heritage sites affected by disaster and conflict offer opportunities for healing and reconciliation. In rebuilding the fabric of their own lives in the face of painful memories, communities retain or create physical memorials in the landscape recording the psychological damage of ‘crimes against humanity’ or devastation of disasters in terms of human lives lost. In turn, as visitor attractions, opportunities arise for a range of community interpretations and ongoing dialogue with tourists.”

[Community-driven conservation and local empowerment]

“[4.1] Community engagement in the enhancement of heritage

a. The connection between communities and their heritage should be recognized, respecting the community’s right to identify values and knowledge systems

embodied in their heritage. Heritage places, be they sites or landscapes, may take on different values for the various communities associated with them and the process of value identification must take each group into consideration.

b. Collaborative networks should be set up at different levels among multiple stakeholders in order to address issues related to heritage and create new value chains through innovative synergies.

c. Dynamic, flexible, inclusive and integrated processes of engagement need to be employed for assessing long-term social impacts of heritage conservation programmes.

[4.2] Bottom-up approach for effective conservation and management of heritage

a. It is important to establish an active role for communities within formal planning/management systems giving the community a voice within conservation decision-making processes.

b. The role of heritage professionals should be recognized as being that of providing technical advice in community-led conservation initiatives and that of a facilitator when a community's engagement with its heritage is fragmented.

c. The 'human' scale of development as a foundation for creative bottom-up approaches should be reinstated."

ICOMOS. 2014. *The Florence Declaration on Heritage and Landscape as Human Values.* Florence, Italy.

"Community: Any group sharing cultural or social characteristics, interests, and perceived continuity through time, and which distinguishes itself in some respect from other groups. Some of the characteristics, interests, needs and perceptions that define the distinctiveness of a community are directly linked to heritage."

Nara +20. 2014. *Nara +20 on Heritage Practices, Cultural Values, and the Concept of Authenticity.* 20th Anniversary of the Nara Document on Authenticity (22-24 October 2014). Nara, Japan.



A group of people who engage with cultural heritage as a dynamic process, shaping and being shaped by its tangible and intangible aspects, including both positive and controversial attributes. Their perceptions and interpretations define heritage as an expression of evolving values, beliefs, knowledge, and traditions, and underpin collective efforts to sustain, transmit, transform, or reject it over time. The social dimension of heritage governs the act of inheriting, which is never passive, as heritage exists through the ways it is perceived, interpreted, or contested by communities. In the context of Dissonant Heritage, dissonance affects not only the physical site but also the social groups connected to it, influencing how they perceive, value, devalue, and interact with the heritage. Recognizing the indispensable role of communities in heritage-making processes, Co.Co.War defines a grass-roots, community-driven approach centred on local voices that actively participate in the understanding, interpretation, and management of difficult legacies. This approach ensures that interventions are respectful, mindful, and sensitive to the social, cultural, and emotional implications of contested sites, and is implemented through strategic tools designed to foster engagement, dialogue, and ongoing interaction with the communities and stakeholders connected to the heritage.

[Co.Co.War Community Toolkit]

A methodological and operational infrastructure designed within the Co.Co. War project to support engagement with communities in contexts of difficult or traumatic heritage, fostering dialogue, observation, and critical reflection. Rather than providing ready-made solutions, it offers a set of tailored tools to explore how dissonant heritage is perceived, experienced, and negotiated by different communities, supporting researchers and practitioners in sensitive contexts, shaped by memory, conflict, and trauma. The Toolkit is organized into six categories — Interviews, Observation, Mapping, Group Activities, Community-Led tools, and Creative tools — each of which reflects a distinct mode of interaction and analytical purpose, providing the broadest possible spectrum of approaches to community engagement. Tools function as relational devices requiring critical awareness and methodological control, with participation as a key approach to

strengthen legitimacy, stewardship, and the inclusion of marginalized voices. The Community Toolkit structures the process of understanding the dissonance and its complexities, highlights areas of agreement, disagreement, tension and conflict, and guides the identification of priorities and compromises in managing Dissonant Heritage. The Community Toolkit operates in conjunction with the Community Process Diagram (CPD). Conceived as project-oriented instruments within the Co.Co.War research framework, they are nonetheless potentially transferable to other contexts, with calibration necessarily adapted to each site.

[Community Process Diagram (CPD)]

A complementary methodological tool of the Co.Co.War Community Toolkit. While the Community Toolkit provides a structured repertoire of instruments to support engagement with communities and the collection and processing of data, the CPD defines when, why, and under which conditions (risks, expectations, ethical boundaries) these tools can be activated within a coherent research process. The CPD does not duplicate the Toolkit; instead, it operates as its methodological backbone, guiding the selection, sequencing, and combination of tools in relation to the evolving objectives of the research. Together, the Community Toolkit and the CPD form a flexible framework for understanding dissonant heritage as a social and spatial condition, shaped by multiple voices, experiences, and interpretations.

➤ Refer also to **Co.Co.War Handbook - Managing Dissonant Heritage**

➤ Refer also to **Co.Co.War Community Toolkit - Understanding (dis)value**

[Co.Co.War](#)

Related sources:

“[8] It is important to underline a fundamental principle of UNESCO, to the effect that the cultural heritage of each is the cultural heritage of all. Responsibility for cultural heritage and the management of it belongs, in the first place, to the

cultural community that has generated it, and subsequently to that which cares for it. However, in addition to these responsibilities, adherence to the international charters and conventions developed for conservation of cultural heritage also obliges consideration of the principles and responsibilities flowing from them. Balancing their own requirements with those of other cultural communities is, for each community, highly desirable, provided achieving this balance does not undermine their fundamental cultural values.”

UNESCO, ICCROM and ICOMOS. 1994. *Nara Document on Authenticity*. Experts meeting (1-6 November 1994). Nara, Japan.

“These are Credibility, Conservation, Capacity-building and Communication. Collectively, these are known as the ‘four Cs’. Whilst New Zealand is of the view that these are very important strategic objectives of the Convention, New Zealand believes that one more strategic objective (a ‘fifth C’) needs to be added. The fifth C which New Zealand believes needs to be added is ‘community’. The New Zealand thesis is that the identification, management and successful conservation of heritage must be done, where possible, with the meaningful involvement of human communities, and the reconciliation of conflicting interests where necessary. It should not be done against the interests, or with the exclusion or omission of local communities.”

UNESCO. 2007. *The “Five Cs” for Communities*. Christchurch, New Zealand.

[Participatory approach]

“Initiatives aimed at creating new forms of participation in heritage or reinforcing existing ones by working with stakeholders and wider interest groups are often known as a ‘participatory approach’.”

UNESCO, ICCROM, ICOMOS, IUCN. 2013. *Managing Cultural World Heritage*. UNESCO. Paris, France.

“The Nara Document assigns responsibility for cultural heritage to specific communities that generated or cared for it. The experience of the last 20 years has demonstrated that cultural heritage may be significant in different ways to a broader range of communities and interest groups that now include virtual global communities that did not exist in 1994. This situation is further complicated by the recognition that individuals can be simultaneously members of more than one community and by the imbalance of power among stakeholders, often determined by heritage legislation, decision-making mechanisms, and economic interests. Those with authority to establish or recognize the significance, value, authenticity, treatment and use of heritage resources have the responsibility to involve all stakeholders in these processes, not forgetting those communities with little or no voice. Heritage professionals should engage in community matters that may affect heritage.”

[*Nara +20. 2014. Nara +20 on Heritage Practices, Cultural Values, and the Concept of Authenticity. 20th Anniversary of the Nara Document on Authenticity \(22-24 October 2014\). Nara, Japan.*](#)

“[36] An essential first stage in the definition and interpretation of any heritage place has to be its initial recognition. For places with memorial aspects, in particular, this first recognition may be informal or community-based.”

[*International Coalition of Sites of Conscience. 2018. Interpretation of Site of Memory. Study commissioned by the World Heritage Centre of UNESCO and funded by the Permanent Delegation of the Republic of Korea.*](#)

[Participatory ranking]

“A methodology used to identify priorities by engaging a group of relevant and knowledgeable participants.”

[*ICCROM. 2022. Harrowell, E. and Tandon, A. \(eds.\). Community-based Heritage Indicators for Peace. A Tool for Measuring Peace. ICCROM. Rome, Italy.*](#)

/CONFLICT

/ CONFLICT

“Conflict occurs when two or more parties believe that their interests are incompatible, express hostile attitudes or take action that damages other parties’ ability to pursue their interests. Conflict in itself is not necessarily negative, but when expressed through violence can be devastating for the people affected.”

ICCROM. 2022. Harrowell, E. and Tandon, A. (eds.). *Community-based Heritage Indicators for Peace. A Tool for Measuring Peace.* ICCROM. Rome, Italy.

SAFERWORLD. *Conflict-sensitive approaches to development, humanitarian assistance and peacebuilding.* Training materials/toolkits.

[Armed conflict]

“Armed conflict is a dispute involving the use of armed force between two or more parties. It is divided into international and non-international armed conflicts.”

ICCROM. 2021. Tandon, A., Harrowell, E. and Selter, E. (eds.). *PATH - Peacebuilding Assessment Tool for Heritage Recovery and Rehabilitation.* ICCROM. Rome, Italy.

ICRC. 2008. *How is the Term “Armed Conflict” Defined in International Humanitarian Law?* International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC). Opinion Paper.

[Conflict prevention]

“Actions taken to prevent conflict and tensions spilling over into overt violence at the local, national and international level.”

International Peace Institute. 2010. Cockayne, J., Mikulaschek, C. and Perry C. (eds.). *The United Nations Security Council and Civil War: First Insights from a New Dataset.* International Peace Institute. New York, USA.

[Latent conflict]

“Tensions and conflicts that are not open (anymore), but have the potential to erupt into overt conflict given the right trigger.”

[ICCROM, 2022](#), Harrowell, E. and Tandon, A. (eds.). *Community-based Heritage Indicators for Peace. A Tool for Measuring Peace*. ICCROM. Rome, Italy.

[Brahm, E. 2003](#). *Latent Conflict Stage*. In: Burgess, G. and Burgess H. (eds.). *Beyond Intractability. Conflict Information Consortium*. University of Colorado, Boulder, USA.

[Recent conflict]

“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.”

[WHC/21/44.COM/INF.8.2. Paris, 23 June 2021. Item 8 of the Provisional Agenda: Nomination process INF.8.2: “Study on sites associated with recent conflicts and other negative and divisive memories” by O. Beazley and C. Cameron](#).

[Conflict analysis]

“A tool or process aimed at developing a multidimensional understanding of a conflict, its root causes, dynamics, stakeholders and potential entry points for building peace.”

[Conflict sensitivity]

“Conflict sensitivity is the ability of an organization to understand the context in which it is operating, and to assess the intergroup tensions and divisive issues

that are likely to induce a conflict. It is also the understanding of the connecting issues, which might help to mitigate conflict and strengthen social cohesion and peace. Conflict sensitivity involves an understanding of the interaction between the proposed intervention and the context, and acting upon it to avoid unintentionally feeding into further divisions. It is an approach that minimises the risks and maximises the positive potential of working in conflict-affected situations.”

ICCROM. 2021. Tandon, A., Harrowell, E. and Selter, E. (eds.). PATH - Peacebuilding Assessment Tool for Heritage Recovery and Rehabilitation. ICCROM. Rome, Italy.



Conflict — within the Co.Co.War project — refers both to real conflicts, such as wars, battles, massacres, genocides, torture, and mass violence (see also “War - Armed Conflict”), and to interpretative conflicts, arising from social, ethnic, cultural, or environmental dynamics. Conflict is understood as both a tangible and intangible arena of division, dispute, collision, or confrontation. It is not inherently negative, but may pose actual or potential risks and, if expressed violently, can be devastating for people and objects, particularly when they hold strong identity significance for the parties involved. In either context, heritage may be subjected to pressures, physical attacks, or polarised, controversial, or unresolved interpretations that influence its perception, conservation, and meaning. Real and interpretative conflicts lie at the heart of heritage dissonance, driving both its challenges and complexity.

[Interpretative conflict]

A form of conflict in dissonant heritage that does not necessarily involve open violence or armed confrontation, but may manifest as uncivil debate, censorship, taboo, disinformation, manipulation, or socially active or latent tensions surrounding a site and its meanings. It is understood as a broader, structural condition from which dissonance may arise or through which it may persist, even after the end of direct hostilities. Interpretative conflict encompasses clashing positions, narratives, memories, and value systems among communities, institutions, or actors, often generating instability, division, hostility and risks

for heritage transmission. In some cases, interpretative conflict can escalate into armed conflict, and conversely, armed conflict can produce conflicting interpretations involving heritage. Recognizing these conflicting positions, root causes, and excluded perspectives is essential for understanding dissonance and for developing conflict-sensitive strategies for conservation, communication, and management.

➤ Refer also to **Co.Co.War Handbook - Managing Dissonant Heritage**

[Co.Co.War](#)

Related sources:

“Art 3: Safeguarding of cultural property

The High Contracting Parties undertake to prepare in time of peace for the safeguarding of cultural property situated within their own territory against the foreseeable effects of an armed conflict, by taking such measures as they consider appropriate.”

“Art. 4: Respect for cultural property

[1] The High Contracting Parties undertake to respect cultural property situated within their own territory as well as within the territory of other High Contracting Parties by refraining from any use of the property and its immediate surroundings or of the appliances in use for its protection for purposes which are likely to expose it to destruction or damage in the event of armed conflict; and by refraining from any act of hostility, directed against such property.”

[UNESCO. 1954. The 1954 Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict and its two \(1954 and 1999\) Protocols.](#)

“Art. 53: Protection of cultural objects and of places of worship

Without prejudice to the provisions of the Hague Convention for the Protection

of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict of 14 May 1954, and of other relevant international instruments, it is prohibited: (a) to commit any acts of hostility directed against the historic monuments, works of art or places of worship which constitute the cultural or spiritual heritage of peoples; (b) to use such objects in support of the military effort; (c) to make such objects the object of reprisals.”

[ICRC. 1977 \(I\). Protocol Additional to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949, and relating to the Protection of Victims of International Armed Conflicts \(Protocol I\)](#), 8 June 1977.

“Art. 16: Protection of cultural objects and of places of worship

Without prejudice to the provisions of the Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict of 14 May 1954, it is prohibited to commit any acts of hostility directed against historic monuments, works of art or places of worship which constitute the cultural or spiritual heritage of peoples, and to use them in support of the military effort.”

[ICRC. 1977 \(II\). Protocol Additional to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949, and relating to the Protection of Victims of Non-International Armed Conflicts \(Protocol II\)](#), 8 June 1977.

“[1] The task of social development after the war, the reconstruction of towns and villages, and the resulting task of the protection of monuments constitutes a single entity. The spiritual values of monuments and the desire to acknowledge them both intellectually and politically were the reasons for initiating their reconstruction.

[...]

Our experience working in the field of monuments protection, in seeing the terrible loss of human life and the destruction of cultural treasures by wars, our experience in the beautiful and responsible work of restoring and newly understanding these monuments, place an obligation on all of us to make every

effort for a more secure peace in the world on the basis of assiduous international cooperation and disarmament.”

ICOMOS. 1982. *Declaration of Dresden on the “Reconstruction of Monuments Destroyed by War”*. Dresden, Germany.

“Mutual understanding and tolerance of diverse cultural expressions add to quality of life and social cohesion. Heritage resources provide an opportunity for learning, impartial interaction and active engagement, and have the potential to reinforce diverse community bonds and reduce conflicts.”

ICOMOS. 2017. *Delhi Declaration on Heritage and Democracy*. Delhi, India.

“In our interconnected world, we know that conflict is rarely confined to the geographical area in which it takes place. Wars nowadays have increasingly global human, material and political effects that reverberate across continents and shape the international order.”

EPRS. 2025. *Mapping threats to peace and democracy worldwide - Normandy Index*. European Parliamentary Research Service. Brussels, Belgium.

/CONSERVATION

/ CONSERVATION

“The conservation of cultural heritage refers to the measures taken to extend the life of cultural heritage while strengthening transmission of its significant heritage messages and values. In the domain of cultural property, the aim of conservation is to maintain the physical and cultural characteristics of the object to ensure that its value is not diminished and that it will outlive our limited time span.”

[ICCROM, 1988. Stovel, H. \(ed\). *Risk Preparedness: A Management Manual for World Cultural Heritage*. ICCROM. Rome, Italy.](#)

[UNESCO Glossary](#)

“ICOM-CC adopts the following terms: “preventive conservation”, “remedial conservation”, and “restoration” which together constitute “conservation” of the tangible cultural heritage. These terms are distinguished according to the aims of the measures and actions they encompass.

The definitions of the terms are as follows:

Conservation: all measures and actions aimed at safeguarding tangible cultural heritage while ensuring its accessibility to present and future generations. Conservation embraces preventive conservation, remedial conservation and restoration. All measures and actions should respect the significance and the physical properties of the cultural heritage item.

Preventive Conservation: all measures and actions aimed at avoiding and minimizing future deterioration or loss. They are carried out within the context or on the surroundings of an item, but more often a group of items, whatever their age and condition. These measures and actions are indirect — they do not interfere with the materials and structures of the items. They do not modify their appearance.

Remedial Conservation: all actions directly applied to an item or a group of items aimed at arresting current damaging processes or reinforcing their structure. These actions are only carried out when the items are in such a fragile condition

or deteriorating at such a rate, that they could be lost in a relatively short time. These actions sometimes modify the appearance of the items.

Restoration: all actions directly applied to a single and stable item aimed at facilitating its appreciation, understanding and use. These actions are only carried out when the item has lost part of its significance or function through past alteration or deterioration. They are based on respect for the original material. Most often such actions modify the appearance of the item.”

[ICOM-CC. 2008. Terminology to characterize the conservation of tangible cultural heritage. Resolution adopted by the ICOM-CC membership at the 15th Triennial Conference \(22-26 September 2008\). New Delhi, India.](#)

See also “**Restoration**”

“Conservation: All actions designed to understand a heritage property or element, know, reflect upon and communicate its history and meaning, facilitate its safeguard, and manage change in ways that will best sustain its heritage values for present and future generations.”

[Nara +20. 2014. Nara +20 on Heritage Practices, Cultural Values, and the Concept of Authenticity. 20th Anniversary of the Nara Document on Authenticity \(22-24 October 2014\). Nara, Japan.](#)

[Conservation discipline]

“The discipline involving treatment, preventive care, and research directed toward the long-term safekeeping of cultural and natural heritage.”

[Getty Research Institute — Art & Architecture Thesaurus.](#)

[Conservation process]

“The action or process of conserving for the preservation of existence, state, life,

health, safeguarding from destructive influences, natural decay, or waste. May apply to conserving a building, object, environment, species, or other thing.”

[Getty Research Institute — Art & Architecture Thesaurus.](#)

[Architectural conservation]

“Describes all interventions pursued by architectural conservators to preserve the integrity of built objects, directed toward the long-term safekeeping of architectural heritage.”

[Getty Research Institute — Art & Architecture Thesaurus.](#)



[Conservation and Management Plan]

See also “**Conservation and Management Plan**” in “**Management**”

➤ Refer also to **Co.Co.War Handbook - Managing Dissonant Heritage**

[Co.Co.War](#)

/DISCOURSE
(HERITAGE
DISCOURSE)

/ DISCOURSE (HERITAGE DISCOURSE)

“Heritage is also a discourse. The idea of discourse does not simply refer to the use of words or language, but rather the idea of discourse used in this work refers to a form of social practice. Social meanings, forms of knowledge and expertise, power relations and ideologies are embedded and reproduced via language. The discourses through which we frame certain concepts, issues or debates have an affect in so far as they constitute, construct, mediate and regulate understanding and debate. Discourse not only organizes the way concepts like heritage are understood, but the way we act, the social and technical practices we act out, and the way knowledge is constructed and reproduced.”

[Smith, L. 2006. *Uses of Heritage*. Routledge. London-New York, p. 4.](#)

[Authorized Heritage Discourse]

“Authorized Heritage Discourse works to naturalize a range of assumptions about the nature and meaning of heritage. [...]. This often self-referential discourse simultaneously draws on and naturalizes certain narratives and cultural and social experiences — often linked to ideas of nation and nationhood. Embedded in this discourse are a range of assumptions about the innate and immutable cultural values of heritage that are linked to and defined by the concepts of monumentality and aesthetics. The authorized discourse is also a professional discourse that privileges expert values and knowledge about the past and its material manifestations, and dominates and regulates professional heritage practices. However, alongside this professional and authorized discourse is also a range of popular discourses and practices. Some of these may take their cue from or be influenced by the professional discourse, but they will not necessarily be reducible to it. Some discourses may also challenge, either actively or simply through their existence, the dominant discourse.”

[Smith, L. 2006. *Uses of Heritage*. Routledge. London-New York, pp. 4-5.](#)

[Authorized Heritage Discourse]

“Authorized Heritage Discourse’ (Smith 2006) normalizes the idea of a single meaning innate to heritage and tends to lock the discourse, ignoring the existence of alternative meanings. The locked discourse of one actor faced with the locked contradictory discourse of another can ultimately lead to conflicts resulting in violence and destruction.”

Kisić, V. 2013. Governing Heritage Dissonance. Promises and Realities of Selected Cultural Policies. European Cultural Foundation, p. 31.

[Inclusive Heritage Discourse]

“Authorized Heritage Discourse is inherently problematic in approaching heritage dissonance, conflicts and human rights, and argues that inclusive heritage discourse provides a suitable framework for dynamic pluralist understanding of the past and for reproaching conflicts. [...] Ignoring or reproaching through violence are just two of a range of possible actions related to heritage dissonance. Many other actions create the space to confront different perspectives, try to understand them, reconsider current positions and possibly construct something new out of them. In the discursive framework which I define as ‘inclusive heritage discourse’ dissonance is acknowledged, and the possibility for different voicing is recognized. This discourse allows that heritage can be talked about and worked with in ways that give space for articulating diverse meanings. As such, dissonance can empower de-naturalization of heritage, foster critical thinking and create opportunities for intense intercultural mediation. Therefore, the tension and energy that dissonance in heritage brings is not necessarily the energy of violence, but the energy of action and change, which could be used for the good.”

Kisić, V. 2013. Governing Heritage Dissonance. Promises and Realities of Selected Cultural Policies. European Cultural Foundation, pp. 26, 31.

/DISSONANCE
(DISSONANT
HERITAGE)

/ DISSONANCE (DISSONANT HERITAGE)

[Dissonance in Heritage]

“Dissonance in heritage involves a discordance or a lack of agreement and consistency, which in turn immediately prompts the question, ‘between what elements does dissonance occur?’ [...] The implicit analogy with musical harmony and its classification of disharmonious combinations of sound can be extended by an analogy drawn from psychology, which makes use of the idea of cognitive dissonance, a state of psychic tension caused by the simultaneous holding of mutually inconsistent attitudes or the existence of a lack of consonance between attitudes and behaviour.”

[Heritage Dissonance through Heritage Disinheritance]

“This idea of ‘heritage dissonance’ through ‘heritage disinheritance’ stems partly from the problem of choice of content from among the many possible heritages available at a given point in time; and partly from the problem of what to do with existing heritages that no longer conform to the present goals of the heritage creation exercise; because they contain messages that are dissonant in the context of the prevailing norms and objectives or in terms of the dominant ideology. Heritage [...] is a contemporary creation, but as each generation creates its own new heritage, it leaves behind it, if not inunortalised at least for very long periods of time, traces of that heritage for future generations — whether or not those future generations either need it or want it. The choices made by one society about which history to transform into heritage present a donation of preserved objects, sites and buildings, as well as commemorated personalities and events, to each succeeding generation, with which it has to come to terms regardless of the intervening changes in that society.”

[All heritage is dissonant]

“[...] dissonance is universal in that it is a condition, whether active or latent, of all heritage to some degree. It is the incidence and magnitude of this ‘some degree’ that provides a geography of dissonant heritage.”

“The very context of heritage issues, and the debates and social and cultural experiences that they feed into and subsequently help to legitimize and de-legitimize, means that all heritage is dissonant as all heritage is political and thus ‘uncomfortable.’”

[Tunbridge, J.E. and Ashworth, G.J. 1996. *Dissonant heritage. The Management of the Past as a Resource in Conflict.* Wiley. Chichester, pp. 20, 30, 21, 307.](#)

[Heritage is dissonant]

“Heritage is dissonant — it is a constitutive social process that on the one hand is about regulating and legitimizing, and on the other hand is about working out, contesting and challenging a range of cultural and social identities, sense of place, collective memories, values and meanings that prevail in the present and can be passed to the future.”

[Smith, L. 2006. *Uses of Heritage.* Routledge. London-New York, p. 4.](#)

[Undesirable Heritage]

“It is for these reasons that I want to focus on what happens when ideas of the continuity, persistence and substantiality of heritage for identity become problematic, as in the Nazi instance. This is a case in which the physical remains of the past offer up an identity that many of those in the present wish to distance themselves from, even while, at the same time, recognising it as fully part of their history. This is the dilemma of ‘undesirable heritage’, a subcategory of what Tunbridge and Ashworth call ‘dissonant heritage’. Undesirable heritage raises questions about just what continues over time and whether identities can change even if their former physical manifestations remain the same. Undesirable heritage may also generate practical dilemmas over whether, for example, physical heritage should be destroyed or altered in order to obliterate an ugly past or to try to shape changing identities.”

[Macdonald, S. 2006. *Undesirable Heritage: Fascist material culture and historical consciousness in Nuremberg.* *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 12\(1\), pp. 9-28.](#)

[Difficult Heritage]

“[...] what I call ‘difficult heritage’ — that is, a past that is recognised as meaningful in the present but that is also contested and awkward for public reconciliation with a positive, self-affirming contemporary identity. ‘Difficult heritage’ may also be troublesome because it threatens to break through into the present in disruptive ways, opening up social divisions, perhaps by playing into imagined, even nightmarish, futures. By looking at heritage that is unsettling and awkward, rather than at that which can be celebrated or at least comfortably acknowledged as part of a nation’s or city’s valued history, my aim is to throw into relief some of the dilemmas about its public representation and reception. Doing so highlights and unsettles cultural assumptions about and entanglements between identity and memory, and past, present and future. It also raises questions about practices of selection, preservation, cultural comparison and witnessing — practices which are at least partly shared by anthropologists and other researchers of culture and social life.”

[*Macdonald, S. 2009. Difficult Heritage. Negotiating the Nazi past in Nuremberg and Beyond. Routledge. London-New York, p. 1.*](#)

[Heritage Dissonance VS Dissonant Heritage]

“Relying strongly on the concept of ‘dissonant heritage’ as a discord or lack of agreement in the way the past is represented and interpreted by different actors (Tunbridge & Ashworth 1996, 21-27), I do not use the term dissonant heritage as such for two reasons. First, the term indicates that there is a certain type of heritage that has an unusual quality and requires different treatment than usual, ‘normal’ heritage (Smith 2006, 80-82). The recognition that heritage is dissonant would make the term dissonant heritage a pleonasm. Second, the term focuses on heritage as object and obscures agencies, actions and power related to heritage. I use the term ‘heritage dissonance’ instead, since it acknowledges that any heritage has dissonance as a quality, and its meanings are contingent. Dissonance exists as a latent quality of any heritage — it is present as a passive potential. This latent

quality becomes active only when new voices are articulated (Laclau & Mouffe 1985; Laclau 1993; Couldry 2010) and unlock the already established discourse related to that particular heritage. Therefore, in certain moments and contexts dissonance has been worked out and is not an active issue, since the processes of heritage management resulted in objectivity or sedimentation (Laclau 1994, 34) of one discourse. At some other moments dissonance unlocks the dominant discourse and creates political struggles, burning tensions, confusions, disputes or conflicts which have to be addressed and renegotiated. The road from active dissonance towards consonance is not an irreversible process and dissonance can be activated and recreated even if there has been a long-term agreement about what certain heritage is, means and represents. An earlier sedimented discourse can, at any time, enter the play of politics and be problematized in new articulations (Laclau & Mouffe 1985, 105; Jorgensen & Phillips 2002, 26-30). Also, active dissonance can give way to objectivity in which one perspective gets naturalized and the consensus prevails for some time. Therefore, the boundary between latent and active dissonance is fluid and historical.”

Kisić, V. 2013. Governing Heritage Dissonance. Promises and Realities of Selected Cultural Policies, European Cultural Foundation, pp. 29-30.

[Contested Heritage]

“Although ‘contested cultural heritage’ has not always been specified in these words, the concept has been cogently present for at least 25 years in anthropology, archaeology, history, geography, architecture, urbanism, and tourism (to name the most obvious disciplines) and is now a framework driving much applied research in these fields internationally. This is because we live in an increasingly fraught world where religious, ethnic, national, political, and other groups manipulate (appropriate, use, misuse, exclude, erase) markers and manifestations of their own and others’ cultural heritage as a means for asserting, defending, or denying critical claims to power, land, legitimacy, and so forth.”

“A continuous stream of publications in the 1990s consolidated the Kuhnian

paradigm shift toward a socially engaged, politically aware study of the past that regards heritage as contested, recognizes the role of power in the construction of history, focuses on the production of identity, emphasizes representation and performance, and preferentially analyzes formerly colonial states and societies and their subaltern populations.”

[Silverman, H. 2011.](#) *Contested Cultural Heritage: A Selective Historiography*. In: Silverman, H. (ed.). 2011. *Contested Cultural Heritage. Religion, Nationalism, Erasure, and Exclusion in a Global World*. Springer Nature, p. 1, 5.

[Dissonant Heritage]

“The difficulty or dissonance of heritage appears in interpretative strategies created by various stakeholders carrying out its evaluation, which stems from the type of materials (e.g., highly sensitive ones) and objects, historical and cultural conditions, current political determinants, ethical, religious and legal issues as well as the personal beliefs and motivations of individuals and groups involved in the interpretative process. The consequence of these discrepancies, tensions and, in some cases, real entanglements and conflicts, is that there are many challenges in sustaining and managing this kind of heritage. Even if plurality and awareness are today a part of heritage discourses, there are monuments, intangible assets and memories which still remain difficult to manage and which deserve special attention.”

[UNA EUROPA. 2024.](#) Battilani, P., Belcastro, M.G., Kowalski, K., Nicolosi T. (eds). *Dissonant Heritage. Concepts, Critiques, Cases*. Una Europa Cultural Heritage Series. Bologna University Press. Bologna.

[Dissonant Heritage]

“There are many definitions of ‘Dissonant Heritage’ — this is how the DHAG frames it: Dissonant heritage can include places related to national-socialist, fascist, nationalist and communist regimes, as well as places related to war, persecution,

or colonization. It can be connected to negative memories, to conflicts and to controversial readings of the past. ‘Dissonant’ is not a fixed label on a site, but it rather describes the current public perception for it. Dissonance can arise or fade away depending on the controversy between present and past.”

[Dissonant Heritage Action Group](#)



[Dissonance]

Dissonance is an intrinsic condition of heritage whereby an asset becomes the object of discordance — like musical disharmony — emerging from divisive and conflicting perceptions, memories, and interpretations within the ongoing social process of heritage-making. It may remain latent or become manifest through a variety of causes and over different temporalities, assuming diverse forms and intensities, influencing processes of heritage recognition and legitimisation, and potentially threatening the conservation of its physical structure and the transmission of the intangible dimensions associated with its multifaceted, evolving values.

[Dissonant Heritage]

The term ‘Dissonant Heritage’ (also described as Contested, Contentious, or Difficult Heritage) refers to forms of heritage that, although recognised as meaningful in the present, are marked by tension and contestation due to their association with conflicting memories, narratives, and representations of the past or, in some cases, represent the tangible traces of painful or shameful episodes in a community’s past. In line with relevant scholarship, the Co.Co.War project conceptualizes Dissonant Heritage as an emerging phenomenon within the continuous process of heritage interpretation and making, particularly affecting highly sensitive tangible assets. Viewed through the lens of architectural conservation, it focuses on buildings, sites, and cultural landscapes whose memories and significance may threaten the preservation and transmission of both material and memorial layers, challenging the core aims of Restoration as a discipline. Research on Dissonant Heritage highlights

the evolving and selective nature of heritage values, shaping social and cultural practices of safeguarding, care, and protection or, conversely, exclusion, denial, and destruction. Building on Alois Riegl's concept of *Kunstwollen* (*Stilfragen*, 1893) — often translated as 'artistic volition' or 'will to form', understood as the collective artistic impulse unique to each historical period or culture, ensuring continuity as long as it aligns with that will — the project introduces and explores *Kriegswollen*, its counterpoint, activated through dissonance and triggering processes of heritage disinheritance. Co.Co.War specifically addresses war-related dissonance, which can act as both a cause and consequence of conflicts—whether armed or interpretative (including polarized narratives, disinformation, manipulation, or taboo). It proposes innovative, community-based, value-oriented strategies for managing difficult legacies, integrating the often-overlooked nexus of conservation and communication. The project aims to transform contested sites into liminal spaces for critical engagement with history, fostering social cohesion and public participation, promoting plurality and awareness within heritage discourse, encouraging multiperspectivity in remembrance, and enhancing the complexity of heritage.

see also “**Value**”

[Co.Co.War](#)

/EXPOSURE

/ EXPOSURE

“The situation of people, infrastructure, housing, production capacities and other tangible human assets located in hazard-prone areas.

Annotation: Measures of exposure can include the number of people or types of assets in an area. These can be combined with the specific vulnerability and capacity of the exposed elements to any particular hazard to estimate the quantitative risks associated with that hazard in the area of interest.”

[United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction \(UNDRR\). 2017. *The Sendai Framework Terminology on Disaster Risk Reduction*. “Exposure”.](#)



Exposure is the presence of people, assets, structures, infrastructures, or other tangible elements in contexts affected by hazards associated with dissonance, making them susceptible to potential loss or damage. Applied to Dissonant Heritage, it involves assessing who and what is exposed to the effects of dissonance, considering both the extent and the nature of a site’s use, as well as understanding its significance for different communities and the reasons behind it. Additionally, evaluating the level of tension and hostility caused by dissonance provides useful information on the scale of exposure: high when public events or protests mobilize large numbers around a divisive asset, even temporarily, and low when the site is abandoned or deliberately excluded from public use due to contested memories. Methodologically, the assessment of a dissonant heritage site’s exposure follows the analysis of dissonance as a stratified and complex hazard and its related vulnerabilities (*Understanding phase — Co.Co. War Handbook > four-phase management process*).

See also “**Risk**”

➤ Refer also to **Co.Co.War Handbook - Managing Dissonant Heritage**

➤ Refer also to **Co.Co.War Community Toolkit - Understanding (dis)value**

[Co.Co.War](#)

/HAZARD

/ HAZARD

“A process, phenomenon or human activity that may cause loss of life, injury or other health impacts, property damage, social and economic disruption or environmental degradation.

Annotations: Hazards may be natural, anthropogenic or socionatural in origin. Natural hazards are predominantly associated with natural processes and phenomena. Anthropogenic hazards, or human-induced hazards, are induced entirely or predominantly by human activities and choices. This term does not include the occurrence or risk of armed conflicts and other situations of social instability or tension which are subject to international humanitarian law and national legislation. Several hazards are socionatural, in that they are associated with a combination of natural and anthropogenic factors, including environmental degradation and climate change. Hazards may be single, sequential or combined in their origin and effects. Each hazard is characterized by its location, intensity or magnitude, frequency and probability. Biological hazards are also defined by their infectiousness or toxicity, or other characteristics of the pathogen such as dose-response, incubation period, case fatality rate and estimation of the pathogen for transmission. Multi-hazard means (1) the selection of multiple major hazards that the country faces, and (2) the specific contexts where hazardous events may occur simultaneously, cascadingly or cumulatively over time, and taking into account the potential interrelated effects.

Hazards include (as mentioned in the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030, and listed in alphabetical order) biological, environmental, geological, hydrometeorological and technological processes and phenomena.”

[United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction \(UNDRR\). 2017. *The Sendai Framework Terminology on Disaster Risk Reduction*. “Hazard”.](#)



A harmful condition, process, or phenomenon associated with dissonance.

Unlike other hazards — e.g., an earthquake, whose probability of occurrence can normally be calculated — dissonance in heritage is not a contingent event but

an inherent aspect of a site or asset [Tunbridge & Ashworth, 1996]. Instead of attempting to quantify it, the focus should be on a thorough analysis of its nature, causes, intensity, and potential impact. This analysis is carried out during the initial engagement with the site (*Understanding* phase — Co.Co.War Handbook > four-phase management process) to develop conflict- and dissonance-sensitive awareness. Key steps for investigating dissonance include: examining the geopolitical and social context, mapping its historical evolution, identifying actors and factions, analyzing scale and manifestations (visible and invisible), and assessing material and immaterial consequences as well as existing strategies with their relative impact. Reliable indirect sources and direct engagement with communities and local experts (Co.Co.War Community Toolkit) are recommended; for open or still-evolving cases, periodic consultation with an active Observatory monitoring the situation is advisable. Examples of such analyses are provided in the Co.Co.War Atlas and Geo-app.

See also “**Risk**”

- Refer also to **Co.Co.War Handbook - Managing Dissonant Heritage**
- Refer also to **Co.Co.War Community Toolkit - Understanding (dis)value**
- Refer also to **Co.Co.War Atlas - Mapping Dissonant Heritage**
- Refer also to **Co.Co.War Geo-app**

[Co.Co.War](#)

/HERITAGE

/ HERITAGE

[Cultural Heritage]

“Cultural heritage includes artefacts, monuments, a group of buildings and sites, museums that have a diversity of values including symbolic, historic, artistic, aesthetic, ethnological or anthropological, scientific and social significance. It includes tangible heritage (movable, immobile and underwater), intangible cultural heritage (ICH) embedded into cultural, and natural heritage artefacts, sites or monuments. The definition excludes ICH related to other cultural domains such as festivals, celebration etc. It covers industrial heritage and cave paintings.”

[UNESCO Glossary](#)

[Architectural Heritage]

“Definition of the architectural heritage

[1] For the purposes of this Convention, the expression “architectural heritage” shall be considered to comprise the following permanent properties:

1. monuments: all buildings and structures of conspicuous historical, archaeological, artistic, scientific, social or technical interest, including their fixtures and fittings;
2. groups of buildings: homogeneous groups of urban or rural buildings conspicuous for their historical, archaeological, artistic, scientific, social or technical interest which are sufficiently coherent to form topographically definable units;
3. sites: the combined works of man and nature, being areas which are partially built upon and sufficiently distinctive and homogeneous to be topographically definable and are of conspicuous historical, archaeological, artistic, scientific, social or technical interest.”

[Council of Europe. 1985. Convention for the Protection of the Architectural Heritage of Europe. European Treaty Series- No. 121. Granada, Spain.](#)

[Cultural Heritage]

“Art 2: Definition

[a] cultural heritage is a group of resources inherited from the past which people identify, independently of ownership, as a reflection and expression of their constantly evolving values, beliefs, knowledge and traditions. It includes all aspects of the environment resulting from the interaction between people and places through time.”

[The Faro Convention. 2005. Council of Europe Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society \(CETS No. 199\). Faro, Portugal.](#)

[Cultural Heritage]

“[2] cultural heritage consists of the resources inherited from the past in all forms and aspects - tangible, intangible and digital (born digital and digitized), including monuments, sites, landscapes, skills, practices, knowledge and expressions of human creativity, as well as collections conserved and managed by public and private bodies such as museums, libraries and archives. It originates from the interaction between people and places through time and it is constantly evolving. These resources are of great value to society from a cultural, environmental, social and economic point of view and thus their sustainable management constitutes a strategic choice for the 21st century;

[3] cultural heritage is a major asset for Europe and an important component of the European project;

[4] cultural heritage as a non-renewable resource that is unique, non-replaceable or non-interchangeable is currently confronted with important challenges related to cultural, environmental, social, economic and technological transformations that affect all aspects of contemporary life.”

[Council of the European Union. 2014. Council conclusions of 21 May 2014 on cultural heritage as a strategic resource for a sustainable Europe \(2014/C 183/08\). Official Journal of the European Union - C 183/36.](#)

[Heritage]

“All inherited assets which people value for reasons beyond mere utility. Heritage is a broad concept and includes shared legacies from the natural environment, the creations of humans and the creations and interactions of humans and nature. It encompasses built, terrestrial, freshwater and marine environments, landscapes and seascapes, biodiversity, geodiversity, collections, cultural practices, knowledge, living experiences, etc.”

[UNESCO, ICCROM, ICOMOS, IUCN. 2023. *Enhancing Our Heritage Toolkit 2.0: Assessing Management Effectiveness of World Heritage Properties and Other Heritage Places*. UNESCO. Paris, France.](#)

[Heritage as a factor, sector, and vector]

“‘Heritage as a factor’ is a stage where the quality of built cultural heritage was acknowledged and used as a resource to support economic value. The stakeholders include among others tourism, construction and the real estate sector. Heritage as a factor [was] trained towards marketisation.

[...]

‘Heritage as a sector’ is disconnected from spatial planning and dealing with built environments as museum objects and was the predominant paradigm up until late 20th century. Here, the traditional stakeholders are experts and heritage authorities. Heritage as a sector brought institutionalisation with focus on activities for collection and preservation.

[...]

The recent 21st century approach is ‘heritage as a vector’. Here the attention has shifted towards intangible heritage and people’s knowledge, traditions and memories associated with artefacts and built heritage places. The shift entails a change in focus from artefacts to people, to their memories and sense of belonging. The present and ongoing process is concerned with socialisation and placing heritage as a common good for society.”

[CHARTER Glossary. 2024](#)

[Council of Europe. 2018. *European Cultural Heritage Strategy for the 21st Century. Based on the Recommendation of the Committee of Ministers to member States on the European Cultural Heritage Strategy for the 21st century \(CM/Rec\(2017\)1\).*](#)

[Janssen, J., Luiten, E., Renes, H., & Stegmeijer, E. \(eds.\). 2017. Heritage as sector, factor and vector: conceptualizing the shifting relationship between heritage management and spatial planning. *European Planning Studies*, 25\(9\), pp. 1654-1672.](#)

Related sources:

“Europe’s cultural heritage, both tangible and intangible, is our common wealth - our inheritance from previous generations of Europeans and our legacy for those to come. It is an irreplaceable repository of knowledge and a valuable resource for economic growth, employment and social cohesion. It enriches the individual lives of hundreds of millions of people, is a source of inspiration for thinkers and artists, and a driver for our cultural and creative industries. Our cultural heritage and the way we preserve and valorise it is a major factor in defining Europe’s place in the world and its attractiveness as a place to live, work, and visit. Cultural heritage is a shared resource, and a common good. Like other such goods it can be vulnerable to over-exploitation and under-funding, which can result in neglect, decay and, in some cases, oblivion. Looking after our heritage is, therefore, our common responsibility.”

[European Commission. 2014. *Towards an integrated approach to cultural heritage for Europe.* Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions. Brussels, Belgium, 22.7.2014.](#)

/IDENTITY

/ IDENTITY

[Cultural Identity]

“Denotes the correspondence which exists between a community (national, ethnic, linguistic, etc.) and its cultural life, as well as the right of each community to its own culture.”

[UNESCO Thesaurus](#)

“Those characteristics or conditions of a thing, person, or group that remain the same amid change or that distinguish a thing, person, or group from another.”

[Getty Research Institute — Art & Architecture Thesaurus.](#)

“Identity is understood as the common reference of both present values generated in the sphere of a community and past values identified in its authenticity.”

[ICOMOS. 2000. The Charter of Krakow 2000. Principles for Conservation and Restoration of Built Heritage. Krakow, Poland.](#)

See also “**Authenticity**”

Related sources:

“Art. 1: Cultural diversity, a common heritage of humanity

Culture takes on diverse forms across time and space. This diversity is manifested in the originality and plurality of the identities that characterise the groups and societies that make up humanity. As a source of exchange, innovation and creativity, cultural diversity is as necessary for humankind as biological diversity

is for living organisms. As such, it constitutes the common heritage of humanity and must be recognised and consolidated for the benefit of present and future generations.”

“Art. 2: From cultural diversity to cultural pluralism

In our increasingly diversified societies, it is essential to ensure harmonious interaction and a willingness to live together of people and groups with cultural identities that are at once plural, varied and dynamic.”

“Art.7: Cultural heritage, source of creativity

All creation has its origins in cultural traditions, but is fully developed in contact with other cultures. This is why heritage, in all its forms, must be preserved, enhanced and passed on to future generations as a testimony of human experience and aspirations, in order to nurture creativity in all its diversity and inspire genuine dialogue between cultures.”

UNESCO. 2001. *Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity*. UNESCO. Paris, France.

“Article 4: Definitions

[1] Cultural diversity

Cultural diversity refers to the manifold ways in which the cultures of groups and societies find expression. These expressions are passed on within and among groups and societies. Cultural diversity is made manifest not only through the varied ways in which the cultural heritage of humanity is expressed, augmented and transmitted through the variety of cultural expressions, but also through diverse modes of artistic creation, production, dissemination, distribution and enjoyment, whatever the means and technologies used.

[2] Cultural content

Cultural content refers to the symbolic meaning, artistic dimension and cultural values that originate from or express cultural identities.”

UNESCO. 2005. *Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions*. UNESCO. Paris, France.

/IMPACT
(DIRECT -
INDIRECT)

/ IMPACT (DIRECT - INDIRECT)

“The effects or consequences of a factor on the attributes of the property, both in terms of the attributes’ state of conservation and their ability to convey the heritage values.”

[UNESCO, ICCROM, ICOMOS, IUCN. 2023. *Enhancing Our Heritage Toolkit 2.0: Assessing Management Effectiveness of World Heritage Properties and Other Heritage Places.* UNESCO. Paris, France.](#)

[Direct Impact]

“A direct impact is the result of a cause-and-effect relationship between a project and a specific attribute of World Heritage or other environmental components.”

[UNESCO, ICCROM, ICOMOS, IUCN. 2022. *Guidance and Toolkit for Impact Assessments in a World Heritage Context.* UNESCO. Paris, France.](#)

[Indirect Impact]

“Indirect impacts are impacts on the environment which are not a direct result of the project, often produced away from or as a result of a complex pathway. Sometimes referred to as ‘second’ or ‘third-level’ impacts, or ‘secondary’ impacts.”

[UNESCO, ICCROM, ICOMOS, IUCN. 2022. *Guidance and Toolkit for Impact Assessments in a World Heritage Context.* UNESCO. Paris, France.](#)

[Heritage Impact Assessment]

“A Heritage Impact Assessment is an activity-specific or project-level assessment that is focused on identifying and assessing the potential effect of a proposed activity or project on the heritage/conservation values of a natural and/or cultural heritage place.”

[UNESCO, ICCROM, ICOMOS, IUCN. 2022. *Guidance and Toolkit for Impact Assessments in a World Heritage Context.* UNESCO. Paris, France.](#)

/INTANGIBLE
(CULTURAL HERITAGE)

/ INTANGIBLE (CULTURAL HERITAGE)

[Intangible cultural heritage]

“Art. 2: Definition

[1] The intangible cultural heritage means the practices, representations, expressions, knowledge, skills — as well as the instruments, objects, artefacts and cultural spaces associated therewith — that communities, groups and, in some cases, individuals recognise as part of their cultural heritage. This intangible cultural heritage, transmitted from generation to generation, is constantly recreated by communities and groups in response to their environment, their interaction with nature and their history, and provides them with a sense of identity and continuity, thus promoting respect for cultural diversity and human creativity.”

[UNESCO. 2003. Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage. UNESCO. Paris, France.](#)

[Intangible values or ‘associative values’]

“[28] Most heritage places will have intangible values derived from peoples’ feelings about, understanding of, and relationship to a place, its history, and the uses to which it has been traditionally put. More and more, intangible values (also known as ‘associative values’) are an important element of many heritage places, even of those with spectacular architectural or archaeological remains, or outstanding natural features. Often this interest in intangible values is expressed as a desire to know more about the people who lived and worked at such a place, rather than about particular architectural styles or archaeologically-defined cultures. Recognition of such associative values is important not only for interpretation but also for the management of a heritage place.”

[International Coalition of Sites of Conscience. 2018. Interpretation of Site of Memory. Study commissioned by the World Heritage Centre of UNESCO and funded by the Permanent Delegation of the Republic of Korea.](#)

[Intangible cultural heritage]

“Intangible cultural heritage (ICH) is an important aspect of cultural heritage in all societies around the world. Intangible and tangible heritage is inextricably linked as traditional, social or cultural practices and knowledge that are transmitted from generation to generation and which provide an understanding of and give meaning, value and context to objects, sites and other physical spaces. It is constantly evolving in response to a community’s environment, its interaction with nature and its history. [...]

Intangible cultural heritage includes practices, representations, expressions, knowledge systems skills and associated objects, archives and documents. The value of such living cultural expressions is related to identity; memory and remembrance; belief and symbolism; nature and the environment; knowledge systems and sites. Such intangible cultural heritage is enacted, transmitted and revived within communities in response to their environment, their interaction with nature and their history. Communities may move elsewhere, maintaining a continuity of their intangible cultural heritage expressions at a site in another location.”

[ICOMOS. 2024. International Charter and Guidance on Sites with Intangible Cultural Heritage. ICOMOS. Charenton-le-Pont, France.](#)

Related sources:

“[1] Recognizing that the spirit of place is made up of tangible (sites, buildings, landscapes, routes, objects) as well as intangible elements (memories, narratives, written documents, festivals, commemorations, rituals, traditional knowledge, values, textures, colors, odors, etc.), which all significantly contribute to making place and to giving it spirit, we declare that intangible cultural heritage gives a richer and more complete meaning to heritage as a whole and it must be taken

into account in all legislation concerning cultural heritage, and in all conservation and restoration projects for monuments, sites, landscapes, routes and collections of objects. [...].”

ICOMOS. 2000. *Québec Declaration on the Preservation of the Spirit of Place.* Adopted at Québec, Canada.

“Protection: Heritage is to be managed as a whole with both its facets — tangible and intangible.”

ICOMOS. 2003. *Place — Memory — Meaning: preserving intangible values in monuments and sites.* 14th General Assembly and Scientific Symposium. Zimbabwe, South Africa.

/INTEGRITY

/ INTEGRITY

[Integrity - Physical property]

“The condition of being unimpaired, complete, or undivided. The concept denotes material wholeness and may be applied to objects or built works.”

[Getty Research Institute — Art & Architecture Thesaurus.](#)

“Integrity applies to both natural and cultural properties, and is defined as a measure of the completeness or intactness of the attributes that convey Outstanding Universal Value. According to the World Heritage Resource Manual ‘Managing Cultural Heritage’ (UNESCO 2013), the key words to understanding integrity are ‘wholeness’, ‘intactness’ and ‘absence of threats’. These can be understood as follows:

- Wholeness: all the necessary attributes are within the property;
- Intactness: all the necessary attributes are still present — none are lost or have been significantly damaged or have decayed;
- Absence of threats: none of the attributes are threatened by development, deterioration or neglect.”

[UNESCO Glossary](#)

“Integrity:

[87] All properties nominated for inscription on the World Heritage List shall satisfy the conditions of integrity.

[88] Integrity is a measure of the wholeness and intactness of the natural and/or cultural heritage and its attributes. Examining the conditions of integrity, therefore requires assessing the extent to which the property:

- a) includes all elements necessary to express its Outstanding Universal Value;
- b) is of adequate size to ensure the complete representation of the features and

processes which convey the property's significance;

c) suffers from adverse effects of development and/or neglect. This should be presented in a statement of integrity.

[89] For properties nominated under criteria (i) to (vi), the physical fabric of the property and/or its significant features should be in good condition, and the impact of deterioration processes controlled. A significant proportion of the elements necessary to convey the totality of the value conveyed by the property should be included. Relationships and dynamic functions present in cultural landscapes, historic towns or other living properties essential to their distinctive character should also be maintained.”

With regard to the aforementioned statement:

“[78] To be deemed of Outstanding Universal Value, a property must also meet the conditions of integrity and/or authenticity and must have an adequate protection and management system to ensure its safeguarding.

[...]

[96] Protection and management of World Heritage properties should ensure that their Outstanding Universal Value, including the conditions of integrity and/or authenticity at the time of inscription, are sustained or enhanced over time.”

[UNESCO. 2025. *The Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention*. WHC.25/01, 16 July 2025.](#)

Related sources:

“Article 9: Sustainable use of the cultural heritage

To sustain the cultural heritage, the Parties undertake to:

- a) promote respect for the integrity of the cultural heritage by ensuring that decisions about change include an understanding of the cultural values involved;
- b) define and promote principles for sustainable management, and to encourage maintenance;
- c) ensure that all general technical regulations take account of the specific

conservation requirements of cultural heritage;

d) promote the use of materials, techniques and skills based on tradition, and explore their potential for contemporary applications;

e) promote high-quality work through systems of professional qualifications and accreditation for individuals, businesses and institutions.”

[The Faro Convention, 2005, Council of Europe Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society \(CETS No. 199\). Faro, Portugal.](#)

“Interpretation and presentation should be an integral part of the conservation process, enhancing the public’s awareness of specific conservation problems encountered at the site and explaining the efforts being taken to protect the site’s physical integrity and authenticity.”

[ICOMOS, 2008, The ICOMOS Charter for the Interpretation and Presentation of Cultural Heritage Sites. Ratified by the 16th General Assembly of ICOMOS, Québec \(Canada, 4 October 2008\).](#)

“Some heritage places include associative values related to remembrance and commemoration and are often described as Sites of Memory. These sites offer particular challenges and opportunities for interpretation and management. If a place’s history is contested, developing inclusive interpretive plans through broad consultation at multiple levels (local, national, international) requires ethical approaches and appropriate methods in order to maintain the integrity of the interpretative process, ensure that stakeholders at all levels feel their perspectives have been considered, and—importantly—leave space for evolving understanding of the events being remembered at the site in the future. These considerations apply to all Sites of Memory, and, indeed, to all heritage places with memorial aspects.”

[International Coalition of Sites of Conscience, 2018, Interpretation of Site of Memory. Study commissioned by the World Heritage Centre of UNESCO and funded by the Permanent Delegation of the Republic of Korea.](#)

/INTERPRETATION

/ INTERPRETATION

“Each generation places a different interpretation on the past and derives new inspiration from it. This capital has been built up over the centuries; the destruction of any part of it leaves us poorer since nothing new that we create, however fine, will make good the loss.”

Council of Europe. 1975. European Charter of the Architectural Heritage. Amsterdam, The Netherland.

“Interpretation refers to the full range of potential activities intended to heighten public awareness and enhance understanding of cultural heritage site. These can include print and electronic publications, public lectures, on-site and directly related off-site installations, educational programmes, community activities, and ongoing research, training, and evaluation of the interpretation process itself.

[...]

Principle 1: Access and Understanding: Interpretation and presentation programmes should facilitate physical and intellectual access by the public to cultural heritage sites. [...]

Principle 2: Information Sources. Interpretation and presentation should be based on evidence gathered through accepted scientific and scholarly methods as well as from living cultural traditions. [...]

Principle 3: Context and Setting. The Interpretation and presentation of cultural heritage sites should relate to their wider social, cultural, historical, and natural contexts and settings. [...]

Principle 4: Authenticity. The Interpretation and presentation of cultural heritage sites must respect the basic tenets of authenticity in the spirit of the Nara Document (1994). [...]

Principle 5: Sustainability. The interpretation plan for a cultural heritage site must be sensitive to its natural and cultural environment, with social, financial, and environmental sustainability among its central goals. [...]

Principle 6: Inclusiveness. The Interpretation and presentation of cultural

heritage sites must be the result of meaningful collaboration between heritage professionals, host and associated communities, and other stakeholders. [...]

Principle 7: Research, Training, and Evaluation. Continuing research, training, and evaluation are essential components of the interpretation of a cultural heritage site. [...]"

[ICOMOS. 2008. The ICOMOS Charter for the Interpretation and Presentation of Cultural Heritage Sites. Ratified by the 16th General Assembly of ICOMOS, Québec \(Canada, 4 October 2008\).](#)

"[23] Interpretation

Interpretation actively enhances public understanding of all aspects of places of cultural heritage value and their conservation. Relevant cultural protocols are integral to that understanding, and should be identified and observed. Where appropriate, interpretation should assist the understanding of tangible and intangible values of a place which may not be readily perceived, such as the sequence of construction and change, and the meanings and associations of the place for connected people. Any interpretation should respect the cultural heritage value of a place. Interpretation methods should be appropriate to the place. Physical interventions for interpretation purposes should not detract from the experience of the place, and should not have an adverse effect on its tangible or intangible values."

[ICOMOS. 2010. ICOMOS New Zealand Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Heritage Value. New Zealand.](#)

"[69] Interpretation should be an integral part of the management of a heritage place, and of its management system. It is difficult to have effective management without an agreed approach to interpretation and outreach. One outcome of effective interpretation will be improved understanding of the heritage place among all its stakeholders (see UNESCO Resource Manuals Managing Cultural

World Heritage and Managing Natural World Heritage).

[70] Interpretation is an essential component of the management of sites with memorial aspects, since it is important to present an inclusive, often nuanced, narrative. Interpretation of contested sites can raise difficult issues, particularly when there are differing views of the significance or history of a particular place, yet it can also present opportunities to bring communities from differing perspectives together through the very process of thoughtfully and inclusively developing the site interpretation. The interpretation of conflicted sites needs special attention and care in order to avoid deepening divides.”

[International Coalition of Sites of Conscience. 2018. *Interpretation of Site of Memory*. Study commissioned by the World Heritage Centre of UNESCO and funded by the Permanent Delegation of the Republic of Korea.](#)

Related sources:

“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.”

[WHC/21/44.COM/INF.8.2. Paris, 23 June 2021. *Item 8 of the Provisional Agenda: Nomination process INF.8.2: “Study on sites associated with recent conflicts and other negative and divisive memories” by O. Beazley and C. Cameron.*](#)

/MANAGEMENT

/ MANAGEMENT

“Use in connection with three main tasks: supervision of and responsibility for the work of others, allocating labour, material and capital to produce a high return, and decision making.”

[UNESCO Thesaurus](#)

[Management cycle]

“The cycle of iterative processes of planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation in terms of the time-frame defined for the management plan for the World Heritage property or other heritage place.”

[UNESCO, ICCROM, ICOMOS, IUCN. 2023. *Enhancing Our Heritage Toolkit 2.0: Assessing Management Effectiveness of World Heritage Properties and Other Heritage Places*. UNESCO. Paris, France.](#)

[Management objectives]

“The primary aims that will guide the management system of a heritage place and ensure that its values are maintained over the long term. Management objectives first need to be defined in relation to the values of the heritage place before addressing other objectives (such as tourism and visitation or sustainable development) that are also important but not essential to maintain its significance. These objectives will form a basis for the development of management strategies, plans, policies and actions.”

[UNESCO, ICCROM, ICOMOS, IUCN. 2023. *Enhancing Our Heritage Toolkit 2.0: Assessing Management Effectiveness of World Heritage Properties and Other Heritage Places*. UNESCO. Paris, France.](#)

[Management planning]

“The process used to establish how to get from the present situation (here) to a desired situation in the future (there). This requires a clear understanding of the present situation and deciding what is to be achieved and what actions to take, within a specific budget and time-frame. Planning for a World Heritage property or other heritage place can involve many different types of planning at various geographic scales and institutional levels.”

[UNESCO, ICCROM, ICOMOS, IUCN. 2023. Enhancing Our Heritage Toolkit 2.0: Assessing Management Effectiveness of World Heritage Properties and Other Heritage Places. UNESCO. Paris, France.](#)

[Management process]

“The series of processes which contribute to the management of the World Heritage property or other heritage place. In broad terms, the following processes are considered:

- decision-making processes;
- planning processes;
- implementation processes;
- monitoring and evaluation processes.

These broad processes in themselves can involve other processes (e.g. visitor management, community engagement, human and financial resource management) to effectively manage the heritage place. Processes should be based on a range of accepted policies, procedures, and standards so there is a clear idea of what the process entails, what is expected to be delivered, and the extent to which established or accepted processes are being followed.”

[UNESCO, ICCROM, ICOMOS, IUCN. 2023. Enhancing Our Heritage Toolkit 2.0: Assessing Management Effectiveness of World Heritage Properties and Other Heritage Places. UNESCO. Paris, France.](#)

[Management system]

“The term ‘management system’ can be explained as a series of processes which together deliver a set of results, some of which feed back into the system to create an upward spiral of continuous improvement of the system, its actions and its achievements. [...]

A ‘management system for cultural heritage’ helps to conserve and manage a given property or group of properties in a way that protects heritage values, in particular the OUV if it is a World Heritage property, and, where possible, enhances wider social, economic and environmental benefits beyond the confines of each property. This wider engagement deters practices detrimental to the cultural heritage but also facilitates the identification and promotion of a property’s heritage values. Moreover, it delivers a constructive role for cultural heritage in enhancing human development which in the long-term will bring a return, augmenting the sustainability of the cultural heritage itself. The future success of heritage management systems, in particular for World Heritage, depends greatly on their ability, amongst other things, to:

- employ a values-led approach;
- deliver approaches that anticipate and manage change;
- invest in the relationship between heritage and society, constantly examining why and how cultural heritage should be conserved and for whom and with whom.”

[...]

“It identifies nine basic characteristics (or ‘lowest common denominators’) that are common to all heritage management systems (i.e. those critical components that are to be found in all examples). It then groups the nine characteristics into three elements (legal framework, institutional framework and resources); three processes (planning, implementation and monitoring); and three results (outcomes, outputs and improvements).”

[UNESCO, ICCROM, ICOMOS, IUCN. 2013. *Managing Cultural World Heritage*. UNESCO. Paris, France.](#)

[Management system]

“[108] Each nominated property should have an appropriate management plan or other documented management system which must specify how the Outstanding Universal Value of a property should be preserved, preferably through participatory means.

[109] The purpose of a management system is to ensure the effective protection of the nominated property for present and future generations.

[110] An effective management system depends on the type, characteristics and needs of the nominated property and its cultural and natural context. Management systems may vary according to different cultural perspectives, the resources available and other factors. They may incorporate traditional practices, existing urban or regional planning instruments, and other planning control mechanisms, both formal and informal. Impact assessments for proposed interventions are essential for all World Heritage properties. [...]”

[UNESCO, 2025. The Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention. WHC.25/01, 16 July 2025.](#)



A strategic, adaptive and long-term process through which dissonant heritage is understood, interpreted, negotiated, and guided over time, rather than being definitively resolved or stabilized in its meanings. Contested or traumatic heritage should be conceived as a space for negotiation between past and present, where conflict, ambiguity, and plurality are recognized as structural conditions of the sites to be managed rather than eliminated. Resolution can be problematic both when it takes the form of violent dissociation — often resulting in the abandonment or destruction of monuments and buildings, following the simplistic logic that erasing a physical manifestation would also erase its associated difficult or traumatic memory — and when it leads to a pacified and forcibly harmonious acceptance of the past, which may be equally detrimental by flattening and reducing the complexity of heritage and its multiple, evolving meanings. Managing dissonant heritage is central to the Co.Co.War approach,

conceived as a dynamic, open, and iterative process rather than a fixed, event-centred project. It involves a sequence of structured, multidisciplinary activities over the short, medium, and long term, primarily operating along the dual axes of heritage conservation and communication. Such a process must be founded on a rigorous and critical analysis of the given context, be holistic, democratic, and participatory, and never be forced, as it requires time for reflection, re-elaboration, and progressive collective symbolic integration. From this perspective, the management of dissonant heritage should not be reduced to a mere managerial task, as it involves a far more complex set of social, cultural, political, and psychological mechanisms. Despite the uniqueness of each context, comparative analysis reveals recurring patterns of dissonance, pointing to a flexible and adaptable four-phase management process for dissonant heritage — *Identify, Understand, Envision, and Evolve* — conceptualized in the Co.Co.War Handbook.

[Co.Co.War Handbook: Managing Dissonant Heritage]

A practical and conceptual guide developed within the Co.Co.War research project to support researchers and practitioners in the deep understanding and conscious management of contested legacies, particularly related to architectural heritage and sites, with a focus on conservation and communication. The manual adopts a non-linear, yet progressive and spiral process, allowing for the retracing of all phases, continuous monitoring of effects, and the assessment of impacts and criticalities to recalibrate the process as conditions, perceptions, or risks evolve. The process consists of the following phases: *Identifying* the site or asset; *Understanding* its attributes, values, and disvalues; *Envisioning* a sustainable and feasible conservation and management plan that addresses both the architectural vocation of the place and the social dynamics of its context; and *Evolving* through implementation, monitoring, and iterative revision to ensure positive co-evolution and transmission to future generations. This operational tool provides roadmaps for developing strategies and actions to pilot interventions on a wide range of assets characterized by conflicting, divisive, and traumatic meanings. It operates in close collaboration with the Co.Co.War Community Toolkit to identify stakeholders and define the processes and methods for acquiring, validating, and interpreting data gathered through engagement with communities.

[Conservation and Management Plan]

An overarching strategic and operational framework for protecting, managing, and activating a dissonant heritage site over time. Grounded in a shared vision, objectives, and priorities, it translates theory into practice by identifying feasible strategies and coordinating conservation and communication actions that can realistically be implemented in the specific context, based on research, contextual analysis, and stakeholder engagement. The plan integrates knowledge of the site and its associated dissonance, providing concrete opportunities for its future and supporting broader processes such as peacebuilding and shared memory. Its management component ensures long-term sustainability, continuous sensitivity to delicate contexts, and the ability to iteratively review and recalibrate the plan in response to changing conditions or emerging risks.

See also “**Conservation**”

➤ Refer also to **Co.Co.War Handbook - Managing Dissonant Heritage**

➤ Refer also to **Co.Co.War Community Toolkit - Understanding (dis)value**

[Co.Co.War](#)

Related sources:

“Heritage places should have a management system. What this is in practice will depend on the character of the site itself, including its ownership, and also on its legal and social context, whether national or regional. The management system can therefore take a wide variety of forms. Key characteristics of any management system should include openness and transparency, the involvement of all stakeholders including local communities, and a shared understanding of all the heritage values of the place. Normally management will be part of a cyclical process of planning, implementation, monitoring, evaluation and feedback.”

[International Coalition of Sites of Conscience. 2018. Interpretation of Site of Memory. Study commissioned by the World Heritage Centre of UNESCO and funded by the Permanent Delegation of the Republic of Korea.](#)

/MEMORY

/ MEMORY

“Memory recorded in the documentary heritage is an irreplaceable way of transmitting tradition and historical awareness, which are important components in processes of identity affirmation, as well as for mutual understanding and dialogue between various social groups held together by community bonds.”

[Warsaw Declaration. 2011. Culture—Memory—Identities.](#)

[Historical memory]

“[15] Historical memory, sometimes named collective memory or social memory, refers to the way in which groups of people create and then identify with specific narratives about historical periods or events. [...]

[17] Memory is a highly selective and multi-layered experience, developed and justified by ideals and expectations that collide with difficult realities. Today’s uncertainty and perplexity in the face of increased complexity is addressed by a populist discourse that puts forward ‘memories’ that have power over a confusing reality and uphold the strength and power of tradition. Memory is owned — individually or collectively — and often synthesised in objects, sites, and monuments.”

[Council of Europe. 2024. Multiperspectivity in remembrance and history education for democratic citizenship. Committee on Culture, Science, Education and Media.](#)

[Collective Memory]

“A form of memory that transcends the individual and is shared by a group. It is not static but rather a process of contesting various past accounts. Sites of contestation include family discussions, museums, monuments and memorials, history textbooks and national holidays.”

[Contested History Glossary](#)

[Site of Memory]

“[51] Sites of Memory for the purposes of this report are places which are vested with historical, social or cultural significance because of what has happened there in the past. Such places can be of particular significance given their role in shaping the identity of a community or nation. Some are obviously primarily Sites of Memory and their principal value is generally seen as such. Others will have aspects of memory among their values which may not be seen by the public at large as the principal aspect of their value. We have referred to such places as places / sites with memorial aspects.

[52] In a Site of Memory, the associative values can be of greater importance than the material ones and can convey a variety of meanings, even though the material remains can be vital in understanding the associative values.

[...]

[57] Then, there are sites with memorial aspects related to conflicts or dramatic events, the interpretations of which may raise difficulties and disputes.”

[International Coalition of Sites of Conscience. 2018. *Interpretation of Site of Memory*. Study commissioned by the World Heritage Centre of UNESCO and funded by the Permanent Delegation of the Republic of Korea.](#)

Related sources:

“The world’s documentary heritage belongs to all, should be fully preserved and protected for all and, with due recognition of cultural mores and practicalities, should be permanently accessible to all without hindrance. The Memory of the World Programme aims to: facilitate preservation of the world’s documentary heritage, particularly in areas affected by conflict and/or natural disaster, enable universal access to documentary heritage worldwide, enhance public awareness about the significant of documentary heritage among the wider public.”

[UNESCO. *The Memory of the World Programme*.](#)

“The International Coalition of Sites of Conscience is the only worldwide network dedicated to transforming places that preserve the past into spaces that promote civic action. Sites of Conscience recognize 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 use the past to activate the present is the hallmark of the Sites of Conscience movement. As a network of more than 400 Sites of Conscience in 80 countries, we engage tens of millions of people every year in using the lessons of history to take action on challenges to democracy and human rights today.”

[International Coalition of Sites of Conscience. 2018. Interpretation of Site of Memory. Study commissioned by the World Heritage Centre of UNESCO and funded by the Permanent Delegation of the Republic of Korea.](#)

“[23] For the Council of Europe, remembrance is about keeping a memory alive, preventing denial or loss of memory about horrors that have happened in the past. When remembrance is organised officially by governments, it is often the case that people are being asked to remember something they did not directly experience themselves. Victims or those who were affected do not need reminders: they are generally unable to forget. Official remembrance allows those who were not directly affected to become aware of events and publicly acknowledges the suffering of the victims.”

[Council of Europe. 2024. Multiperspectivity in remembrance and history education for democratic citizenship. Committee on Culture, Science, Education and Media.](#)

/MULTIPERSPECTIVITY

/ MULTIPERSPECTIVITY

“In Europe, the term multiperspectivity has been extensively disseminated. The Council of Europe recommends that history teaching should contribute to ‘the development of a multipleperspective approach in the analysis of history, especially the history of the relationships between cultures’ (Council of Europe 2011). Multiperspectivity, like the analysis of sources, is also a vital aspect of understanding the historical dimension of any event. It entails distinguishing facts from opinions and understanding that there is no universal historical truth, but rather a number of diverse interpretations of a given event. Although multiperspectivity is increasingly emphasised as essential, research has shown that many history teachers struggle with addressing multiple coexisting perspectives. They need to possess deep knowledge of their discipline, and often have limited time and limited access to resources. [...]

Multiperspectivity and the appropriate handling of controversial and sensitive issues in history lessons, can be a powerful tool to support peace and reconciliation in societies. By learning about difficult history from the angle of human rights and democracy, using interactive and cooperative learning methodologies, young people will gain confidence and competency in discussing complex and controversial historical events affecting their communities and societies from a multi-perspective and nuanced point of view.”

[Council of Europe. 2024. Multiperspectivity in remembrance and history education for democratic citizenship. Committee on Culture, Science, Education and Media.](#)

[Council of Europe. 2011. Recommendation CM/Rec\(2011\)6 of the Committee of Ministers to member states on intercultural dialogue and the image of the other in history teaching.](#)

“Multiperspectivity is fundamental to understanding different standpoints which often result from a specific historical context. [...] Concerning curriculums and

methodologies [is recommended] to develop multiperspectivity in history education to analyse different standpoints that together create the historical dimension of any event; [...] introduce co-operative learning in small groups and develop interactive pedagogies which acknowledge cultural differences and multiple identities [...]"

[Council of Europe. 2022. *The Observatory on History Teaching in Europe.* Committee on Culture, Science, Education and Media.](#)

"The idea is that history is an interpretive process with multiple possible narratives or the practice of teaching multiple historical narratives as opposed to one 'correct' narrative."

[Contested History Glossary](#)

[Multiple narratives]

"[29] The acknowledgement of a diversity of stakeholders and their often divergent understanding of the associative values of heritage sites has led to changes in approaches to interpretation. The increasing numbers of visitors, the recognition that heritage places can have a variety of meanings for different communities, each with its own narrative which in many cases may be conflicting, and the economic drive to cultivate tourism have, among other factors, resulted over the last half-century in the development of interpretation as a discipline and profession in its own right. Increasingly, it is now recognised that interpretation of most heritage places should be inclusive of multiple narratives and viewpoints. Therefore, as with other aspects of heritage management, interpreters and planners need to identify and work with a wide range of groups who have connections to particular sites."

[International Coalition of Sites of Conscience. 2018. *Interpretation of Site of Memory.* Study commissioned by the World Heritage Centre of UNESCO and funded by the Permanent Delegation of the Republic of Korea.](#)

[Pluralism]

“Represents the view that people with different views on life and its different parts can co-exist in a society in an appropriate way. Thus, political actions can be based on different people equally.”

[Contested History Glossary](#)

Related sources:

“[...] the use of participative methods of heritage making, management and interpretation such as discussions, evaluations, oral histories, personal collecting, crowd-collecting, crowd-curating and artistic interventions might be useful for starting a dialogue around the past, remembrance and identity politics, for encouraging multiperspectivity and critical approach to heritage.”

[Kisić, V. 2013. *Governing Heritage Dissonance. Promises and Realities of Selected Cultural Policies*. European Cultural Foundation, p. 26.](#)

“In order to grasp the nuances and complexities, an approach which acknowledges variation, dissonance and is therefore fundamentally bottom-up rather than top-down is demanded (Ashworth et al. 2007). This goes in line with a so-called Inclusive Heritage Discourse (IHD) (Kisić 2016) [...]. By so doing, the approach goes hand in hand with more recent heritage conventions, in particular the so-called Faro Convention (Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society), developed by Council of Europe in 2005 and entered into force in 2011 (Council of Europe 2005), through recognizing the ‘heritage communities’ as meaningful creators and participators of heritage, and thereby pluralizing perspectives upon the past.”

[Wollentz, G. 2020. *Landscapes of Difficult Heritage*. Springer. Cham, Switzerland, p. 8.](#)

/NEGOTIATION

/ NEGOTIATION

“Attempting to reach an agreement through discussion.”

[Getty Research Institute](#) — [Art & Architecture Thesaurus](#).

[Heritage mediation]

“Contributes to raising awareness through communication between professionals, policymakers and communities, by bringing resources together. It also helps determine and understand cross-sectoral needs, enables and drives engagement with cultural heritage, and facilitates intellectual and physical access to cultural heritage.”

[European Union. 2019. *Fostering cooperation in the European Union on skills, training and knowledge transfer in cultural heritage professions*. Publications Office of the European Union. Luxembourg.](#)

Related sources:

“Heritage is about negotiation — about using the past, and collective or individual memories, to negotiate new ways of being and expressing identity. In this process heritage objects, sites, places or institutions like museums become cultural tools or props to facilitate this process — but do not themselves stand in for this process or act.”

[Smith, L. 2006. *Uses of Heritage*. Routledge. London-New York, p. 4.](#)

“In using the term ‘negotiating’ I seek to draw attention to debates and arguments, and to the fact that dealings with difficult heritage typically involve ongoing conflicts of interest and differences of view. A negotiated social practice

is differentiated, mobile and emergent rather than homogeneous, fixed or the product of underlying laws. Additionally, I use 'negotiating' because it can also refer to physical movement in relation to objects — negotiation can be an embodied or material as well as a discursive practice. The physical dealings with the site — the destruction, partial destruction or restoration of parts of it and the movement and sensations of individuals encountering it — are part of its negotiation. This is not, however, simply movement between or around fixed positions. Rather, negotiating is a more active process in which spaces, identifications, alignments and even objects are positioned and given recognition.”

Macdonald, S. 2009. Difficult Heritage. Negotiating the Nazi past in Nuremberg and Beyond. Routledge. London-New York, p. 19.

“The idea of heritage dissonance sheds light on heritage as a political process of negotiation, mediation and regulation of identities, conflicts and power relations.”

Kisić, V. 2013. Governing Heritage Dissonance. Promises and Realities of Selected Cultural Policies. European Cultural Foundation, p. 57.

/PERCEPTION

/ PERCEPTION

“The process of becoming aware of objects, qualities, or relations via the sense organs; involves the reception, processing, and interpretation of sensory impressions.”

[Getty Research Institute](#) — Art & Architecture Thesaurus.



The act of perceiving through which individuals, groups, communities, and organizations become aware of heritage via sensory stimuli, which are analysed and interpreted through intuitive, psychological, cognitive, and emotional processes.

[Conflicting perceptions]

Conflicting perceptions are radically different, and sometimes opposing, perceptions, sensitivities, and attitudes that emerge from the evolving processes through which cultural heritage is produced, used, interpreted, safeguarded, marginalised, or rejected, becoming a source of vulnerability in relation to present-day risks associated with dissonance. In the context of Dissonant Heritage, perception is not an optional layer but a constitutive component: dissonance arises from the coexistence of divergent perceptions and interpretations of attributes, values, and meanings that contribute to the cultural significance of a place. Perception is shaped not only by the physical characteristics of a site or by objectively measurable data, but also by memories, fears, emotional attachments, political positions, generational differences, and broader social, political, and territorial conditions. Perception is a pivotal domain for investigating dissonance, understood as a plural, dynamic, and context-dependent process. Within the Co.Co.War methodology for managing dissonant heritage, the analysis of ‘conflicting perceptions’ is central to the *Understanding* phase (Co.Co.War Handbook > four-phase management process) and draws on the Community Toolkit to disentangle the complexities of dissonance through direct engagement

with communities and stakeholders. This approach helps identify which aspects of a site are perceived as controversial, hazardous, or alienating, as well as how interpretations diverge and evolve across social groups and over time. Exploring the multiple facets and pluralities of perception is not merely about recording information, but a key field of knowledge for deeply understanding dissonance and guiding informed processes of conservation, communication, and management.

➤ Refer also to **Co.Co.War Handbook - Managing Dissonant Heritage**

➤ Refer also to **Co.Co.War Community Toolkit - Understanding (dis)value**

[Co.Co.War](#)

Related sources:

“Interpretation and presentation should encourage individuals and communities to reflect on their own perceptions of a site and assist them in establishing a meaningful connection to it. The aim should be to stimulate further interest, learning, experience, and exploration.”

[ICOMOS. 2008. *The ICOMOS Charter for the Interpretation and Presentation of Cultural Heritage Sites*. Ratified by the 16th General Assembly of ICOMOS, Québec, Canada \(4 October 2008\).](#)

[Differing perceptions]

“[32] Associative values can be identified by many different groups. Apart from heritage professionals, such groups can include local communities, other communities with interest in a particular place or type of heritage, and groups, which are sometimes marginalised, such as youth or the elderly, women, indigenous peoples or the descendants of those associated with a particular place in the past. Such groups can be locally or remotely located. In the latter case they may be a virtual group. They will all have their own perceptions, which

may change through time, of the values of a place. Sometimes values can be contested between different groups.

[33] These ideas of value need to be taken into account in developing interpretation as well as access plans for a heritage place. Site managers need to facilitate the identification of such differing perceptions through broad community consultation and, to the degree possible, ensure that the diverse narratives of the places for which they care are considered and integrated into interpretive plans. Associative values can also affect the management of heritage places.”

[International Coalition of Sites of Conscience. 2018. *Interpretation of Site of Memory*. Study commissioned by the World Heritage Centre of UNESCO and funded by the Permanent Delegation of the Republic of Korea.](#)

/PRESERVATION

/ PRESERVATION

“The aim of preservation is to obviate damage liable to be caused by environmental or accidental factors, which pose a threat in the immediate surroundings of the object to be conserved. Accordingly, preventive methods and measures are not usually applied directly but are designed to control the microclimatic conditions of the environment with the aim of eradicating harmful agents or elements, which may have a temporary or permanent influence on the deterioration of the object.”

[UNESCO Glossary](#)

[Historic Preservation]

“Refers to actions taken to promote the protection and continued use of the built environment for cultural, aesthetic, or historic reasons. For actions taken specifically to return an object, site, or structure to a state of historical correctness, see ‘restoration (process)’. For actions taken generally to prevent further changes or deterioration in objects, sites, or structures, see ‘preservation’. For actions taken to return an already deteriorated structure to sound condition, see ‘rehabilitating’.”

[Getty Research Institute — Art & Architecture Thesaurus.](#)

[Preserving]

“The process of performing actions to halt damage or to keep any object, material, or system from injury or destruction. For example, it may refer to the preservation of food or an ecological system. For the function of preservation, use ‘preservation (function)’ or a specific type of preservation, such as ‘historic preservation’. For the discipline of involving treatment and long-term preventive care of cultural and natural heritage objects and systems, use ‘conservation’.”

[Getty Research Institute — Art & Architecture Thesaurus.](#)

/PREVENTION

/ PREVENTION

“Activities and measures to avoid existing and new disaster risks. Annotations: Prevention (i.e., disaster prevention) expresses the concept and intention to completely avoid potential adverse impacts of hazardous events. While certain disaster risks cannot be eliminated, prevention aims at reducing vulnerability and exposure in such contexts where, as a result, the risk of disaster is removed. Examples include dams or embankments that eliminate flood risks, land-use regulations that do not permit any settlement in high-risk zones, seismic engineering designs that ensure the survival and function of a critical building in any likely earthquake and immunization against vaccine-preventable diseases. Prevention measures can also be taken during or after a hazardous event or disaster to prevent secondary hazards or their consequences, such as measures to prevent the contamination of water.”

[United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction \(UNDRR\). 2017. *The Sendai Framework Terminology on Disaster Risk Reduction*. “Prevention”.](#)

[Prevention (disaster)]

“Measures taken to reduce the likelihood of losses. Ideally, these measures would seek to reduce losses to zero, but this often is not possible. Key question: How much prevention do you need to undertake?”

[UNESCO Glossary](#)

/PROTECTION

/ PROTECTION

“Protection is the act or process of applying measures designed to affect the physical condition of a property by defending or guarding it from deterioration, loss or attack, or to cover or shield the property from danger or injury. In the case of buildings and structures, such treatment is generally of a temporary nature and anticipates future historic preservation treatment; in the case of archaeological sites, the protective measure may be temporary or permanent.”

[UNESCO Glossary](#)

“Refers to the conservation, preservation and restoration of cultural property, as well as to its protection against vandalism, theft and removal from country of origin.”

[UNESCO Glossary](#)

“Protection: Heritage is to be managed as a whole with both its facets — tangible and intangible.”

[ICOMOS. 2003. *Place — Memory — Meaning: preserving intangible values in monuments and sites*. 14th General Assembly and Scientific Symposium. Zimbabwe.](#)

Related sources:

“Art. 5:

To ensure that effective and active measures are taken for the protection, conservation and presentation of the cultural and natural heritage situated on its

territory, each State Party to this Convention shall endeavor, in so far as possible, and as appropriate for each country:

[a] to adopt a general policy which aims to give the cultural and natural heritage a function in the life of the community and to integrate the protection of that heritage into comprehensive planning programmes;

[b] to set up within its territories, where such services do not exist, one or more services for the protection, conservation and presentation of the cultural and natural heritage with an appropriate staff and possessing the means to discharge their functions;

[c] to develop scientific studies and research and other studies essential to countering the dangers that threaten its cultural or natural heritage;

[d] to take the appropriate legal, technical, administrative and financial measures necessary for the identification, protection, conservation, presentation and rehabilitation of this heritage;

[e] to foster the establishment or development of national or regional centres for training in the protection, conservation and presentation of the cultural and natural heritage and to encourage scientific research in this field.”

UNESCO, 1972. Convention concerning the protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage. Adopted by the General Conference at its seventeenth session Paris, 16 November 1972.

/RECONCILIATION

/ RECONCILIATION

“The restoration of relationships between (groups of) people following a conflict. This can include large-scale intercommunal processes such as national truth and reconciliation committees, and interpersonal or small-scale initiatives to rebuild trust.”

[ICCROM. 2022.](#) Harrowell, E. and Tandon, A. (eds.). *Community-based Heritage Indicators for Peace. A Tool for Measuring Peace*. ICCROM. Rome, Italy.

[ICCROM. 2021.](#) Tandon, A., Harrowell, E. and Selter, E. (eds.). *PATH - Peacebuilding Assessment Tool for Heritage Recovery and Rehabilitation*. ICCROM. Rome, Italy.

[Galtung, J. 1969.](#) Violence, Peace, and Peace Research. *Journal of Peace Research*, Vol. 6, 3, pp. 167-191.

“The act of resolving conflict to gain peace. Beyond simply solving disputes, reconciliation is a process to achieve a deeper mutual understanding to gain long-lasting peace.”

[Contested History Glossary](#)

/RESILIENCE

/ RESILIENCE

“The ability of a system, community or society exposed to hazards to resist, absorb, accommodate, adapt to, transform and recover from the effects of a hazard in a timely and efficient manner, including through the preservation and restoration of its essential basic structures and functions through risk management.”

[United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction \(UNDRR\). 2017. *The Sendai Framework Terminology on Disaster Risk Reduction*. “Resilience”.](#)

“Positive adaptation in the context of adversity.”

[UNESCO Thesaurus](#)



Resilience refers to the capacity of a dissonant heritage site and its related communities to withstand, absorb, and respond to hostilities, tensions, and stressors without losing continuity as places of meaning, memory, and social engagement. In this context, resilience does not imply the resolution of conflict or a return to an idealized condition of harmony, but rather the ability to remain active and legible within a fragile and contested environment. Within the Co.Co. War methodology, resilience is closely linked to the analysis of vulnerability in the *Understanding* phase (Co.Co.War Handbook > four-phase management process), where the intensity of dissonance helps clarify the site’s condition of fragility and its capacity to respond to disturbances.

[Antifragility (beyond Resilience)]

The capacity of a dissonant heritage site to not merely resist or recover from stressors, but to improve, evolve, and grow through exposure to volatility, disorder, and stressors. While resilience preserves a system’s previous state, antifragility allows disturbance to become an opportunity for improvement and strengthening. In the Co.Co.War perspective, antifragility is particularly relevant

for dissonant heritage: remaining static in contested conditions often generates further criticalities, whereas fostering antifragile qualities can guide interventions that both preserve the site and open it up as a liminal space for dialogue, negotiation, and critical engagement with the past. During the *Evolving* phase (Co.Co.War Handbook > four-phase management process), the implementation and review of strategies and actions are intended as opportunities to strengthen the site's antifragile capacity.

➤ Refer also to **Co.Co.War Handbook - Managing Dissonant Heritage**

➤ Refer also to **Co.Co.War Community Toolkit - Understanding (dis)value**

[Co.Co.War](#)

/RESTORATION

/ RESTORATION

[Restoration project]

“Building projects intended to restore or renovate built works.”

[Getty Research Institute — Art & Architecture Thesaurus.](#)

[Restoration process]

“The process of making changes to an object or structure so that it will closely approximate its original state or other state at a specific time in its history. For changes not considering historical correctness, see ‘remodeling’ or ‘renovation’. When changes are made to prevent further deterioration, see ‘preservation’. More generally, for treatment, preventive care, and research directed toward long-term safekeeping of cultural and natural heritage, see ‘conservation’.”

[Getty Research Institute — Art & Architecture Thesaurus.](#)

“The act or process of accurately depicting the form, features and character of a property as it appeared at a particular period of time, by means of the removal of features from other periods in its history and construction of missing features from the restoration period. The limited and sensitive upgrading of mechanical, electrical and plumbing systems and other code-required work to make properties functional is appropriate within a restoration project.”

[The Getty Conservation. 2002.](#) Tolles, E.L., Kimbro, E.E., Ginell, W.S. *Planning and Engineering Guidelines for the Seismic Retrofitting of Historic Adobe Structures.* The Getty Conservation Institute. Los Angeles, USA.

[ICCROM. 2022.](#) Harrowell, E. and Tandon, A. (eds.). *Community-based Heritage Indicators for Peace. A Tool for Measuring Peace.* ICCROM. Rome, Italy.

/RISK

/ RISK

“The combination of the probability of an event and its negative consequences.”

[ISO/IEC 31010 & ISO Guide 73:2009. *New Standards for the Management of Risk.*](#)

“The chance of something happening that will have a negative impact on our objectives.”

[ICCROM. 2016. Pedersoli, J.L., Antomarchi, C. and Michalski S. \(eds.\). *A Guide to Risk Management of Cultural Heritage.* ICCROM and Government of Canada, Canadian Conservation Institute.](#)

[Risk management]

“Risk management is everything we do to understand and deal with possible negative impacts on our objectives. It includes the identification, analysis, and prioritization (we call it evaluation) of risks. Then we take action to ‘treat’ risks, i.e. to avoid, eliminate or reduce the risks that we consider unacceptable. We can also transfer those risks to others.

For instance, when we insure our collections we transfer the risk of theft or damage to the insurance company (for a fee). If one or more risks are evaluated as acceptable we don’t need to do anything about them. For example, when there is no copyright or security issue, more and more heritage institutions allow their visitors to take pictures using flash because they know that in most cases, the risk of damage by light from flash photography is tiny or very small. In other words, we can consciously accept those risks. It is important to remember that risk management is a continuous process.

We have to keep monitoring the risks and adjusting our actions to ensure that negative impacts on our objectives will be minimized. Used in fields such as

public health, the environment, and technology, risk management is an essential tool for government and industry to reach their objectives in a more controlled and successful way.”

[ICCROM. 2016. Pedersoli, J.L., Antomarchi, C. and Michalski S. \(eds.\). *A Guide to Risk Management of Cultural Heritage*. ICCROM and Government of Canada, Canadian Conservation Institute.](#)



[Dissonance as potential risk]

The possibility that dissonance may generate negative consequences for heritage and for the communities, stakeholders, or other entities connected to it. Based on the assumption that dissonance is a condition — active or latent — present to some degree in all heritage [Tunbridge & Ashworth, 1996], it can be triggered or re-activated under certain circumstances that may threaten democracy and peace, exacerbate divisions among communities, or result in deliberate acts of damage or destruction. Heritage recognized as symbols of past or present conflicts is particularly exposed to risks, especially those linked to the ideologies or rationales behind their construction and to subsequent historical reinterpretations. In conflictual contexts, heritage may be instrumentalized, damaged, or destroyed, representing both material loss and a means of influencing social, cultural, political, and economic dynamics to perpetuate or intensify conflict.

Assessing the risk associated with dissonance is a priority for comprehensive and informed management of dissonant heritage. Risk (R) is conventionally defined as a function of Hazard (H), Vulnerability (V), Exposure (E), and Capacity (C), according to the formula:

$$R = \frac{H \times V \times E}{C}$$

In the Co.Co.War approach, dissonance is both an intrinsic property of heritage and a potential risk; because of its complexity, it cannot be reduced to a numerical indicator alone, as it encompasses layered and rapidly evolving emotional, symbolic, and cultural responses. The overall aim is to detect risk factors

qualitatively and to design mitigation or de-risking strategies. The components of risk — Hazard, Vulnerability, Exposure, Capacity — within a contested site should be critically explored during the *Understanding* phase of the Co.Co.War four-phase management process (Co.Co.War Handbook), requiring thorough knowledge of the place and its dissonance, continuous and consistent engagement with communities (Co.Co.War Community Toolkit), keen sensitivity to context, and a cyclical, adaptive approach to planning, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation. The implementation of specific strategies and actions, however well-intentioned or conceived as beneficial, may, in fact, activate new risks or reactivate residual ones.

➤ Refer also to **Co.Co.War Handbook - Managing Dissonant Heritage**

➤ Refer also to **Co.Co.War Community Toolkit - Understanding (dis)value**

[Co.Co.War](#)

Related sources:

“Indices can be used as early-warning systems and are designed to give policy-makers insights into potential risks and developments in economic, social, environmental, security and political factors. Quantitative indices are also good tools for aggregation and comparison purposes, as well as demonstrating change, evolution and the degree of that evolution in a standardised manner. Depending on their make-up, indices can quantify possibilities of an event occurring in the near/foreseeable future, thus acting as foresight tools.”

[EPRS. 2025. Mapping threats to peace and democracy worldwide - Normandy Index.](#) European Parliamentary Research Service. Brussels, Belgium.

/SIGNIFICANCE

/ SIGNIFICANCE

[Cultural Significance]

“Cultural significance means aesthetic, historic, scientific, social or spiritual value for past, present or future generations. Cultural significance is embodied in the place itself, its fabric, setting, use, associations, meanings, records, related places and related objects. Places may have a range of values for different individuals or groups.

Explanatory Notes: The term ‘cultural significance’ is synonymous with cultural heritage significance and cultural heritage value. Cultural significance may change over time and with use. Understanding of cultural significance may change as a result of new information.”

[The Burra Charter. 2013. The Australia ICOMOS Charter for Places of Cultural Significance. First adoption 1979, minor revisions were made in 1981 and 1988, with more substantial changes in 1999, a final version was adopted by Australia ICOMOS in October 2013.](#)

“The overall importance of a heritage place, determined by the combination of and interactions between its different heritage values. Significance often has different layers, sometimes recognized at different scales: international, national, regional and local. This is the case of World Heritage properties where the focus of the inscription of that property on the World Heritage List is on its Outstanding Universal Value. However, that property will invariably have a range of values with different layers of importance that are part of its overall significance. These other values should also be well understood — good conservation practice requires the harmonious protection, conservation and management of all values.”

[UNESCO, ICCROM, ICOMOS, IUCN. 2023. Enhancing Our Heritage Toolkit 2.0: Assessing Management Effectiveness of World Heritage Properties and Other Heritage Places. UNESCO. Paris, France.](#)

[Significance Assessment]

“Significance Assessment. Ultimately cultural heritage depends on the importance (or significance) that a society places on them and it is this value that has always been the reason underlying heritage conservation. It is self-evident that no society makes an effort to conserve what it does not value. It is necessary to gain a detailed understanding of the nature and extent of the significance that a heritage place has to a society in order to protect, preserve and conserve the values of that place. This requires an assessment, which if not undertaken could potentially lead to decisions being made that diminish or destroy important aspects of the site. The process of determining the values of a heritage place is known as the assessment of cultural significance. The assessment of cultural significance has two interrelated and interdependent elements. The first element is the determination of that which makes a place significant and, therefore, the type (or types) of significance that it manifests. The second is the determination of the degree of significance that this heritage place has for society.”

[UNESCO, 2012.](#) Manders, M.R., Van Tilburg Hans, K. and Staniforth, M. *Significance Assessment*. UNESCO Bangkok. Thailand.

[Significance assessment survey]

“In heritage and other cultural management, a component of a preservation survey which determines and factors in cultural value and significance of a landmark site or a collection to its stakeholders.”

[Getty Research Institute — Art & Architecture Thesaurus.](#)

[Significance assessment process]

In heritage and other cultural management, the process that determines cultural value and significance of a landmark site or a collection for its stakeholders.”

[Getty Research Institute — Art & Architecture Thesaurus.](#)

Related source:

“[1] The setting of a heritage structure, site or area is defined as the immediate and extended environment that is part of, or contributes to, its significance and distinctive character.

[2] Heritage structures, sites or areas of various scales, including individual buildings or designed spaces, historic cities or urban landscapes, landscapes, seascapes, cultural routes and archaeological sites, derive their significance and distinctive character from their perceived social and spiritual, historic, artistic, aesthetic, natural, scientific, or other cultural values. They also derive their significance and distinctive character from their meaningful relationships with their physical, visual, spiritual and other cultural context and settings.”

[ICOMOS. 2005. Xi'an Declaration on the Conservation of the Setting of Heritage Structures, Sites and Areas. Adopted in Xi'an, China by the 15th General Assembly of ICOMOS on 21 October 2005.](#)

/STAKEHOLDER

/ STAKEHOLDER

“Stakeholder: A person, group or organization who has a particular interest in the heritage on the basis of special associations, meanings, and/or legal and economic interests, and who can affect, or be affected, by decisions regarding the heritage.”

[Nara +20. 2014. *Nara +20 on Heritage Practices, Cultural Values, and the Concept of Authenticity*. 20th Anniversary of the Nara Document on Authenticity \(22-24 October 2014\). Nara, Japan.](#)

“Stakeholders are the people who have a direct or indirect interest in, or who affect or are affected by, the implementation and outcome of intervention activities. Typically, they include individuals and representatives of communities, institutions and/or organizations and agencies invested in the project area.”

[ICCROM. 2022. Harrowell, E. and Tandon, A. \(eds.\). *Community-based Heritage Indicators for Peace. A Tool for Measuring Peace*. ICCROM. Rome, Italy.](#)

“Actors who possess direct or indirect interests and concerns about heritage resources, but do not necessarily enjoy a legally or socially recognized entitlement to them.”

[UNESCO, ICCROM, ICOMOS, IUCN. 2023. *Enhancing Our Heritage Toolkit 2.0: Assessing Management Effectiveness of World Heritage Properties and Other Heritage Places*. UNESCO. Paris, France.](#)

“Any individual or group with a stake in an organization or enterprise who may be vitally affected by its actions and should be consulted or considered. Includes stockholders, financially invested parties with a governing interest, but

also employees of a business and the community at large. Usage applied by practitioners of fields such as archaeology and heritage management.”

[Getty Research Institute — Art & Architecture Thesaurus.](#)

“Someone who is either in charge of an action or has power through monetary aid or their professional position. Stakeholders usually have a say in decision-making processes, not necessarily having expertise on the subject.”

[Contested History Glossary](#)

[Heritage Stakeholders]

“Heritage stakeholders not only include the local, regional, national and European public authorities, but also professionals, (international) nongovernmental organisations, the voluntary sector and civil society. Consequently, there is a need to define the roles of everyone involved and to give citizens in particular the means of shouldering their responsibilities.”

[CHARTER Glossary. 2024](#)

Related sources:

“The work of the Council of Europe in the field of cultural heritage has increasingly emphasised an integrated approach that combines the promotion and protection of cultural diversity, democratic governance and democratic innovation. It is essential therefore that decision making involves those most directly affected — the owners, inhabitants, local communities and local authorities — who recognise the specific value of heritage for society. Indeed, national-level cultural heritage protection policies and practices must not be removed from these stakeholders.”

[Council of Europe. 2018. *An Integrated Approach to Cultural Heritage*. The Council of Europe’s Technical Co-operation and Consultancy Programme.](#)

/STRATEGIES

/ STRATEGIES

“A plan that is intended to achieve a particular purpose.”

“The process of planning something or putting a plan into operation.”

[OXFORD Dictionary](#)

“A strategy is a general plan or set of plans intended to achieve something, especially over a long period.”

“Strategy is the art of planning the best way to gain an advantage or achieve success, especially in war.”

[COLLINS Dictionary](#)

“The art of planning a campaign or large military operation.”

“The art of, or a scheme for, managing an affair cleverly.”

[CAMBRIDGE Dictionary](#)



Strategies — in the Co.Co.War perspective — refer to synergic, coherent, and coordinated approaches adopted to guide both conservation and communication processes in relation to dissonant heritage in conflict-sensitive contexts. They include decision-making frameworks, narrative positioning, and sets of actions and tools designed to manage dissonance, mitigate risks associated with it, facilitate negotiation and reconciliation. Strategies are value-oriented and site-specific, giving form to long-term visions, objectives, and

guiding principles for dissonant heritage. They should not manipulate or deny the material and memorial layers embedded in heritage; rather, they should seek to understand them, preserve them, and make them intelligible by broadening the range of perspectives. Finally, strategies are not intended to resolve dissonance; instead, they provide operational frameworks through which it can be understood, framed and addressed responsibly.

The Co.Co.War project does not attempt to establish a formal definition of strategy, recognizing that the term rarely appears as an autonomous entry in heritage glossaries, likely due to its broad and cross-disciplinary usage. Nevertheless, it remains highly relevant in the cultural heritage domain, where it commonly refers to processes aimed at defining overarching objectives, along with the means and methods required to achieve them. In this sense, the term helps frame heritage action not as an isolated intervention, but as a coordinated and purposeful set of decisions developed over time. Its etymology is also significant: derived from the Greek *στρατηγία* (Latin: *strategia*) and historically linked to military command and the art of conducting war, the term originally referred to the planning and management of complex operations. Within the field of dissonant heritage, this origin acquires a meaningful inversion: a concept once associated with warfare becomes central to reflecting on how to address, interpret, and manage the material and memorial effects of war and conflict. This shift underscores the need for long-term, context-sensitive, and critically informed approaches capable of engaging difficult legacies without reducing their complexity.

Within the Co.Co.War project, strategies are grouped into two clusters: *direct strategies*, which affect the physical integrity of heritage assets, and *indirect strategies*, which primarily operate at an intangible level, although they may also influence the physical condition, perception, or future management of a site. These strategies are systematized and defined in the Co.Co.War Handbook, with reference to international restoration charters and programmatic documents in the field of cultural heritage. They are consistently linked to communities and stakeholders (Co.Co.War Community Toolkit), as well as to available resources and the potential benefits and risks arising during implementation, and are subject to periodic monitoring and evaluation. Co.Co.War strategies are identified through the comparative analysis of real-world cases of dissonant heritage, as developed

in the Co.Co.War Atlas and further extended in the Co.Co.War [Geo-app](#). They are not intended as an exhaustive, prescriptive taxonomy or as best practices, but rather as a working framework grounded in recurring approaches observed across different geographical, political, social, and cultural contexts, and are to be shaped and put in practice in response to the specific conditions of each DH case.

DIRECT STRATEGIES:

Conservation

Actions aimed at safeguarding the physical integrity and cultural significance of a site, using minimal and reversible interventions where possible.

Impact on Dissonant Heritage: Helps preserve contested material evidence, but may perpetuate unresolved tensions if narratives remain unaddressed.

Reuse / Adaptive Reuse

Reintroducing a new and compatible function to an existing structure, ensuring long-term viability while retaining heritage values.

Impact on Dissonant Heritage: Can foster reconciliation or reinterpretation, though functional adaptation may obscure or neutralize challenging historical narratives.

Demolition

Intentional destruction, dismantling, removal of a heritage site/architecture or of part of it, implying irreversible loss of material fabric and values.

Impact on Dissonant Heritage: Often regarded as a mechanism for suppressing the memory of a traumatic event, it erases physical traces of contested histories, risking cultural amnesia and marginalization of affected communities.

Reconstruction

Reproducing a previous physical state based on sufficient documentary or material evidence; often linked to symbolic, identity or memorial functions.

Impact on Dissonant Heritage: May enable commemoration and identity assertion, but risks oversimplifying or selectively representing complex or conflicting histories.

Mitigation

Heritage interventions aimed at reducing the negative symbolic, emotional, or perceptual impacts of heritage sites, especially in relation to trauma or contested memory. Typically peripheral or preventive, these measures do not reconstruct or erase the site but seek to attenuate monumental, rhetorical, or traumatic impressions while preserving material and cultural values.

Impact on Dissonant Heritage: Provides partial preservation of memory, yet may be seen as insufficient by communities invested in contested narratives.

Conservation as a Ruin

Maintaining the site as a stabilized ruin without reconstructing missing parts, acknowledging its documentary, aesthetic, and memorial qualities.

Impact on Dissonant Heritage: Preserves traces of trauma and contested history, highlighting historical disruptions and memory gaps, while enabling critical engagement with the past and tempering overly monumental or rhetorical interpretations.

No Action / Non-Intervention

Deliberate choice to refrain from physical intervention for technical, ethical or financial reasons, or to defer intervention until conditions are deemed opportune; may be temporary or long-term.

Impact on Dissonant Heritage: Retains authenticity and preserves evidence of conflict or trauma, though risks deterioration and community frustration over perceived neglect.

➤ INDIRECT STRATEGIES:

Knowledge Building

Systematic, multidisciplinary process of acquiring, managing, and sharing detailed information about cultural heritage to support their conservation, protection, and interpretation.

Impact on Dissonant Heritage: Enables contested narratives to surface and be documented, fostering critical understanding and inclusive memory-making.

Strategic Dialogue

Negotiation and coordination among institutional and community actors to increase awareness and understanding, build shared visions, priorities and decision-making frameworks for heritage.

Impact on Dissonant Heritage: Supports conflict-sensitive management and inclusive interpretation, but may require compromises that dilute contentious elements.

Participatory Process (Bottom-Up)

Active involvement of communities in heritage identification, interpretation, and management, enhancing legitimacy and stewardship.

Impact on Dissonant Heritage: Amplifies marginalized voices and facilitates reconciliation, though divergent perspectives can prolong negotiation and decision-making.

Networking / Communication Activities

Building coalitions and communication channels to mobilize awareness, visibility and support through institutional networks and media.

Impact on Dissonant Heritage: Increases public engagement with contested heritage but may unintentionally favor dominant narratives over subaltern ones.

Educational Programs / Edutainment

Use of heritage as an educational resource through formal learning and experiential or entertainment formats to broaden access.

Impact on Dissonant Heritage: Can foster empathy and critical reflection, yet risks trivializing traumatic or sensitive aspects of contested histories.

Artistic Reflection

Artistic practices (e.g. installation, performance, photography) that critically reinterpret heritage, memory, trauma or contested narratives.

Impact on Dissonant Heritage: Encourages reinterpretation and dialogue, providing alternative ways to engage with difficult pasts while challenging dominant narratives.

Tourism

Activation of heritage as an economic and cultural resource through visitation, interpretation, and experience.

Impact on Dissonant Heritage: Generates awareness and economic support, but commodification may oversimplify or exploit contested histories, resulting in amplifying the conflict.

Policy

Regulatory, planning and governance frameworks defining rules, standards, responsibilities and incentives for heritage protection and use.

Impact on Dissonant Heritage: Provides structural protection and formal recognition, though rigid regulations may fail to capture local contestation or evolving memory practices.

Memorial Practices and Events

Commemorations, rituals and public ceremonies, commemorative plaques that sustain symbolic and memorial values and shape collective identity.

Impact on Dissonant Heritage: Reinforces collective memory and identity, but may privilege certain narratives over others, exacerbating tensions among different groups.

- Refer also to **Co.Co.War Handbook - Managing Dissonant Heritage**
- Refer also to **Co.Co.War Community Toolkit - Understanding (dis)value**
- Refer also to **Co.Co.War Atlas - Mapping Dissonant Heritage**
- Refer also to **Co.Co.War Geo-app**

[Co.Co.War](#)

**/TANGIBLE
(CULTURAL
HERITAGE)**

/ TANGIBLE (CULTURAL HERITAGE)

[Tangible cultural heritage]

“Physical artifacts transmitted intergenerationally in a society and invested with significance in that society.”

[Getty Research Institute](#) — Art & Architecture Thesaurus.

Related sources:

“Protection: Heritage is to be managed as a whole with both its facets — tangible and intangible.”

[ICOMOS. 2003. *Place — Memory — Meaning: preserving intangible values in monuments and sites.* 14th General Assembly and Scientific Symposium. Zimbabwe.](#)

/VALUE

(DIS-VALUE)

/ VALUE (DIS-VALUE)

[Values]

“Values refer to specific manifestations or qualities of a site that can be considered important to a particular stakeholder group. A site can have multiple values, both natural and cultural, for multiple stakeholder groups. Not all values will necessarily be considered relevant to the OUV.”

[UNESCO Glossary](#)

“Cultural heritage value/s means possessing aesthetic, archaeological, architectural, commemorative, functional, historical, landscape, monumental, scientific, social, spiritual, symbolic, technological, traditional, or other tangible or intangible values, associated with human activity.”

“[2] Understanding cultural heritage value

Conservation of a place should be based on an understanding and appreciation of all aspects of its cultural heritage value, both tangible and intangible. All available forms of knowledge and evidence provide the means of understanding a place and its cultural heritage value and cultural heritage significance. Cultural heritage value should be understood through consultation with connected people, systematic documentary and oral research, physical investigation and recording of the place, and other relevant methods. All relevant cultural heritage values should be recognised, respected, and, where appropriate, revealed, including values which differ, conflict, or compete.

The policy for managing all aspects of a place, including its conservation and its use, and the implementation of the policy, must be based on an understanding of its cultural heritage value.”

[ICOMOS. 2010. ICOMOS New Zealand Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Heritage Value. New Zealand.](#)

[Cultural values]

“Cultural values: The meanings, functions, or benefits ascribed by various communities to something they designate as heritage, and which create the cultural significance of a place or object.”

[Nara +20. 2014. Nara +20 on Heritage Practices, Cultural Values, and the Concept of Authenticity. 20th Anniversary of the Nara Document on Authenticity \(22-24 October 2014\). Nara, Japan.](#)

“The qualities for which a heritage place is considered important to be protected for present and future generations. Values are determined by a range of social and cultural factors. What is valued by one section of society may not be valued by another, or may be valued for different reasons, or one generation may value it but it may not have been valued by the previous one. Heritage places may have a range of values: aesthetic, architectural, biological, ecological, historic, geological, social, spiritual, etc. These values are embodied in and conveyed by the attributes of the heritage place.”

[UNESCO, ICCROM, ICOMOS, IUCN. 2023. Enhancing Our Heritage Toolkit 2.0: Assessing Management Effectiveness of World Heritage Properties and Other Heritage Places. UNESCO. Paris, France.](#)

[Values/Disvalues]



Values refer to the plural, living, and evolving set of meanings, qualities, and manifestations associated with heritage, socially (re)created and continuously shaped through the interpretations and negotiations of multiple stakeholders, ultimately influencing the ways in which people engage with heritage and related practices of recognition, conservation, or, conversely, exclusion and neglect. They define what makes a heritage site significant and meaningful (value), while also highlighting elements that provoke discordances, tensions, or potential conflicts due to their association with painful pasts, trauma, or war (disvalue).

Key categories of values include historical, cultural, artistic and technical, rarity, functional and economic, educational, social, spiritual and political value. Disvalues rarely fit fixed categories but may arise from controversial attributes, conflicting perceptions, degradation, or communication patterns that hinder shared understanding. They can reopen historical fractures, unsettle dominant narratives, generate social discomfort, disrupt the present, and influence attitudes toward the preservation of heritage assets.

In Dissonant Heritage, disvalues often prevail, with the result that such sites are primarily perceived as negative or problematic. The “dark side of histories” foregrounds disvalues within the system of meanings attributed to heritage, calling for tailored and critically informed approaches. For this reason, the identification of both values and disvalues is crucial to define a site’s significance and assess the impact of potential loss, highlighting areas of agreement and conflict, as well as informing priorities and trade-offs in the management of difficult legacies.

Within the Co.Co.War research framework, this process guides value-oriented strategies for engaging with contested heritage. Through specific tools and methodologies (Co.Co.War Handbook and Community Toolkit), it enables the understanding of (dis)values while maintaining an open and balanced perspective through the involvement of a broad range of stakeholders. It acknowledges the non-objective and dynamic nature of value interpretation and ensures that positive aspects are recognized even when a site is initially regarded as a source of disvalues.

See also “**Dissonance (Dissonant Heritage)**”

➤ Refer also to **Co.Co.War Handbook - Managing Dissonant Heritage**

➤ Refer also to **Co.Co.War Community Toolkit - Understanding (dis)value**

[Co.Co.War](#)

Related sources:

“Art. 3: The common heritage of Europe

[b] the ideals, principles and values, derived from the experience gained through

progress and past conflicts, which foster the development of a peaceful and stable society, founded on respect for human rights, democracy and the rule of law.”

“Art. 7: Cultural heritage and dialogue

[b] establish processes for conciliation to deal equitably with situations where contradictory values are placed on the same cultural heritage by different communities.”

[The Faro Convention. 2005. Council of Europe Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society \(CETS No. 199\). Faro, Portugal.](#)

“Art.5: Values

Conservation of a place should identify and take into consideration all aspects of cultural and natural significance without unwarranted emphasis on any one value at the expense of others.”

“Art. 13: Co-existence of cultural values

Co-existence of cultural values should always be recognised, respected and encouraged. This is especially important in cases where they conflict. Explanatory notes: For some places, conflicting cultural values may affect policy development and management decisions. In Article 13, the term cultural values refers to those beliefs which are important to a cultural group, including but not limited to political, religious, spiritual and moral beliefs. This is broader than values associated with cultural significance.”

[The Burra Charter. 2013. The Australia ICOMOS Charter for Places of Cultural Significance. First adoption 1979, minor revisions were made in 1981 and 1988, with more substantial changes in 1999, a final version was adopted by Australia ICOMOS in October 2013.](#)

[Value-based approach]

“The values-led approach is, in many ways, a response to the recognition of the increasing complexity of heritage. It evolved in various parts of the world, for instance in Canada and the USA, and became better known through the Burra

Charter, first developed by ICOMOS Australia in 1979 and subsequently updated. The Charter promoted the assessment of the significance of a place — based on the values attributed by all stakeholders (not only by the experts) and the use of a Statement of Significance — as a basis for developing conservation and management strategies. This concept was developed further by the work on Conservation Plans of James Kerr (1982). He brought a systematic approach to developing conservation and management plans based on values and, more importantly, on the cultural significance of a heritage place to society. This approach adopts the premise that people in society ascribe various values to heritage.”

[UNESCO, ICCROM, ICOMOS, IUCN. 2013. *Managing Cultural World Heritage*. UNESCO. Paris, France.](#)

“[...] it was suggested that evaluating and assessing a site as World Heritage should be considered as an ethical commitment to safeguarding and respecting human ‘values’ in order to protect the spirit of place¹ and people’s identity so as to improve their quality of life.”

[ICOMOS. 2014. *The Florence Declaration on Heritage and Landscape as Human Values*. Florence, Italy.](#)

[Competing values]

“The Nara Document calls for respect of cultural diversity in cases where cultural values appear to be in conflict. In the last 20 years it has become evident that competing values and meanings of heritage may lead to seemingly irreconcilable conflicts. To address such situations, credible and transparent processes are required to mediate heritage disputes. These processes would require that communities in conflict agree to participate in the conservation of the heritage, even when a shared understanding of its significance is unattainable.”

[Nara +20. 2014. *Nara +20 on Heritage Practices, Cultural Values, and the Concept of Authenticity*. 20th Anniversary of the Nara Document on Authenticity \(22-24 October 2014\). Nara, Japan.](#)

[Associative values]

“[30] It is possible to classify heritage in many different ways. In the 1972 Convention, heritage is divided into natural and cultural, though even then it was recognised that sites could be ‘the combined works of nature and man’ (Article 1). Increasingly this division between culture and nature is recognised as outmoded. IUCN’s 2008 report Protected Landscapes and Spiritual Values says (p.9) that protected landscapes and seascapes would not exist without the deeply rooted cultural and spiritual values held by the people who once inhabited these places and often continue to care for them. [...]

[31] There are many other systems of classification [...]. However classified, any site can have strong associative values. The range of those values can be very wide, covering religion and society as well as commemorating specific events or happenings.

[32] Associative values can be identified by many different groups. Apart from heritage professionals, such groups can include local communities, other communities with interest in a particular place or type of heritage, and groups, which are sometimes marginalised, such as youth or the elderly, women, indigenous peoples or the descendants of those associated with a particular place in the past. Such groups can be locally or remotely located. In the latter case they may be a virtual group. They will all have their own perceptions, which may change through time, of the values of a place. Sometimes values can be contested between different groups.

[33] These ideas of value need to be taken into account in developing interpretation as well as access plans for a heritage place. [...]

[34] Some heritage places include associative values related to remembrance and commemoration and are often described as Sites of Memory. These sites offer particular challenges and opportunities for interpretation and management. [...]”

[International Coalition of Sites of Conscience. 2018. Interpretation of Site of Memory. Study commissioned by the World Heritage Centre of UNESCO and funded by the Permanent Delegation of the Republic of Korea.](#)

“[16] [...] 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.”

“[18] 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.”

[WHC/21/44.COM/INF.8.2. Paris, 23 June 2021. Item 8 of the Provisional Agenda: Nomination process INF.8.2: “Study on sites associated with recent conflicts and other negative and divisive memories” by O. Beazley and C. Cameron.](#)

“Heritage can be described as a values-based or values-driven phenomenon. [...] Irrespective of what specific meanings are attached to the heritage, what all heritage has in common is that it is valued, culturally, i.e. it is meaningful for people and therefore has value beyond its immediate, practical use-value. The new understanding of heritage recognises cultural relativism: what heritage means to people is subject to change due to the mutability and multivalency of cultural values, and how they are mediated and negotiated. On the other hand, reinterpretation and critical revision of heritage can lead to transformations of cultural value-systems.”

[CHARTER Glossary. 2024](#)

/VULNERABILITY

/ VULNERABILITY

“The conditions determined by physical, social, economic and environmental factors or processes which increase the susceptibility of an individual, a community, assets or systems to the impacts of hazards.”

[United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction \(UNDRR\). 2017. *The Sendai Framework Terminology on Disaster Risk Reduction*. “Vulnerability”.](#)

“The characteristics determined by physical, social, economic and environmental factors or processes that increase the susceptibility of an individual, a community, assets or systems to the impacts of hazards. It produces a range of immediate unsafe conditions such as living in dangerous locations or in poor housing, ill health, political tensions or a lack of local institutions or preparedness measures.”

[ICCROM. 2021. Tandon, A., Harrowell, E. and Selter, E. \(eds.\). *PATH - Peacebuilding Assessment Tool for Heritage Recovery and Rehabilitation*. ICCROM. Rome, Italy.](#)



Vulnerabilities are physical, cultural, social, political, economic and environmental factors or processes that increase the susceptibility of dissonant heritage to the impacts of hazards. They extend beyond the physical fragility of the asset, encompassing conditions that may intensify dissonance, hinder conservation, and compromise social legitimacy and future transmission. The identification of vulnerabilities requires a critical reading of the site’s present condition, which is more than merely recording damage, in order to understand how it responds to dissonance and how vulnerabilities emerge from multiple interacting dimensions (*Understanding* phase — Co.Co.War Handbook, four-phase management process). Key vulnerabilities include controversial attributes — tangible or intangible elements of a site (symbols, architectural features, authorship, ownership, management, legal status, uses, or poor state

of conservation) that may trigger uncomfortable memories or exacerbate dissonance — and conflicting perceptions, as dissonance is closely tied to the diverse and often opposing ways communities and stakeholders perceive and interact with the site. These cannot be fully understood through quantitative data alone and require direct engagement with communities and attention to emotional, generational, and cultural dimensions (Co.Co.War Community Toolkit). Another layer concerns manipulated communication, namely the susceptibility of a site to distorted, biased, or intentionally instrumentalized narratives circulating in media and public discourse, which may alter perception, polarize debate, and threaten both the conservation of the asset and the integrity of its significance. Finally, Co.Co.War methodology relates vulnerability to the site’s position along a spectrum between *fragility* and *antifragility*. Vulnerability should not be seen solely as weakness or exposure to harm, but as a condition that reveals whether a site remains trapped in a static and critical state or can evolve, adapt, and strengthen, becoming a space for dialogue and negotiation through appropriate strategies and actions.

See also “**Risk**”

See also “**Resilience**”

➤ Refer also to **Co.Co.War Handbook - Managing Dissonant Heritage**

➤ Refer also to **Co.Co.War Community Toolkit - Understanding (dis)value**

[Co.Co.War](#)

/WAR
(ARMED
CONFLICT)

/ WAR (ARMED CONFLICT)

See also “**Conflict**”

“Fighting, using soldiers and weapons, between two or more countries, or two or more groups inside a country.”

[CAMBRIDGE Dictionary](#)



War is a long-standing human phenomenon, characterised by armed violence between organised groups (such as states, factions or coalitions), and inherently associated with atrocity and trauma for individuals and communities. The experience of war is frequently linked to dissonance in heritage, as it represents one of the contexts most prone to generating divisive and controversial interpretations, especially when assets and sites embody identity significance for the parties involved. By antonomasia, war symbolizes enemy occupation, evoking in collective memory experiences of subjugation, loss of freedom, suffering, destruction, and death. Heritage most directly connected to war includes buildings designed for military purposes, primarily fortifications and fortified sites, which — particularly in recent or contemporary armed conflicts — persist as physical presences, bearing witness to power and pain, and potentially disrupting local communities. From the Co.Co.War perspective, the scope of dissonance extends beyond contexts of war and military legacies to broader conflict settings — including armed conflicts, interpretative disputes and hybrid wars, which often involve a complex combination of factors such as disinformation — encompassing all highly sensitive sites that have been the focus of hostilities, contestation, or social, political, ethnic, or religious tensions. In addition, in the domain of dissonant heritage, war may be considered both a cause and a consequence of dissonance.

[Co.Co.War](#)

Related sources:

[World Peace]

“World peace cannot be safeguarded without the making of creative efforts proportionate to the dangers which threaten it.”

[Schuman Declaration. 1950. The declaration of 9th May 1950.](#)

[Measuring peace]

“The modern definition of peace refers not only to an absence of war, but also includes elements of wellbeing, social order and justice for individual persons, as people demand and expect more from peace. Peace also encompasses the right to bodily integrity and rights pertaining to moral and cultural values. All humans have the right to life and the right to the means necessary for their development. This positive dimension of peace is difficult to measure as it is a continuum, stretching from inter-state war to positive public perceptions. This continuum includes international violence (i.e. wars, hybrid conflicts) and intra-national violence (i.e. gang or police violence, forced displacements and civil wars). Therefore, any measure of peace has to take numerous dimensions into account. [...]. Recognising the interconnectedness of threats, the rationale behind the Normandy Index is twofold. First, the index focuses on EU external action by selecting and measuring the threats perceived by the EU, which it aims to tackle, prevent, resolve or address. Second, the Normandy Index aims at monitoring the probability (or existence) of conflict (or destabilisation of peace and security) in a given country on the basis of the aggregate level of these threats.”

[Normandy Index for Mapping threats to peace and democracy worldwide]

“Established by the European Parliamentary Research Service (EPRS) following the Normandy Peace Forum in 2019, the Normandy Peace Index has quickly become an important resource for policy-makers and civil society as an annual measurement of threats to peace globally. The results of this latest Index suggest

that the threat level is at its highest yet, reflecting wider trends in worsening security levels worldwide due to conflict, geopolitical rivalry, growing militarisation, trade wars and hybrid threats. At the same time, shifts towards protectionism represent a profound threat to global peace, stability and prosperity, as the interdependent relationships built through open trade slowly unravel.”

[...]

“The Normandy Index differs from other indices in that it adopts an approach tailored by and to EU action. It also defines conflict and the numerous stages between perfect peace and total war as a product of factors linked to the main threats identified by the EU in its external action strategy. The EU Global Strategy identifies the following 11 threats as the main current challenges to peace and security: terrorism, hybrid threats, economic crises, energy insecurity, violent conflicts, climate change, cybersecurity, fragile states, trans-border crime, disinformation, weapons of mass destruction (WMDs).”

EPRS. 2025. Mapping threats to peace and democracy worldwide - Normandy Index. European Parliamentary Research Service. Brussels, Belgium.

“Preamble: Surviving fortifications and military heritage from distant past to recent times have served as a major link to the history of human settlements, nations, and regions. At the same time, the use of these monuments and sites as elements of power projection remain a painful physical reminder for many communities. Understanding and respecting these memories and consequences from the perspective of these communities can generate new identity references that positively re-signify the relationship between population, fortifications and military heritage. [...]”

“Art. 4: The recognition of such intrinsic values of fortifications and defensive heritage determines the extent to which these aspects condition their conservation, rehabilitation, and general value. The fortification as a monument has documentary value as a built structure. It represents architectural, technological, artistic, and historical values related to the events that led to its construction and the meanings that the building acquired over the time. There is also the value of

fortifications seen as a system, as an organizer of the territory. The recognition of these values is what determines the degree to which the fortifications, as part of our heritage, have unique aspects that affect their conservation, rehabilitation, and general value.

- 4.1. Architectural and Technical value [...]
- 4.2. Territorial and geographical value [...]
- 4.3. Cultural Landscape value [...]
- 4.4. Strategic value [...]
- 4.5. Human and Anthropological value [...]
- 4.6. Memory, Identity, Educational value [...]
- 4.7. Historic value [...]
- 4.8. Social/Economic value [...]"

[ICOMOS. 2021. ICOMOS Guidelines on Fortifications and Military Heritage. GA 2021 6-1.](#)

“War has been an almost continuous and permanent human condition dominating the historical chronicles. It has entailed the deliberate infliction directly and indirectly of widespread suffering [...] on populations that can to varying degrees claim innocence. It therefore provides an almost inexhaustible source of potential atrocities. However, short of declaring that all war is by definition atrocity and thereby reducing all humanity to the twin roles of victim and perpetrator, the problem has always been to determine the point at which the horrors inherent in war become atrocity. The scale of death and destruction is rarely in itself the determining factor: individual events involving quite small groups of people may be seen as atrocity when the deaths of hundreds of thousands in other circumstances are not. Thus war is rarely regarded as atrocity in itself but is probably the most important source of various more specific types of atrocity considered below.”

[Tunbridge, J.E., and Ashworth, G.J. 1996. *Dissonant heritage. The Management of the Past as a Resource in Conflict*. Wiley. Chichester, p. 99.](#)

“The question to be answered is whether war by definition is atrocious or whether atrocity is defined by the scale of death, destruction and suffering. According to this, it is very difficult do differentiate between war as atrocity and atrocity in war and therefore here in this context war is regarded as being atrocious in itself and additionally as being a source of atrocity.”

Neugebauer, A. 2009. *Pro-active Dissonant Heritage Management. Reducing Discordances at Sites of Atrocity.* VDM - Verlag Dr. Müller. Saarbrücken, Germany, p. 9.





ALMA MATER STUDIORUM
**UNIVERSITÀ
DI BOLOGNA**



**UNIVERSITÀ
POLITECNICA
DELLE MARCHE**



**Politecnico
di Torino**

Dipartimento
di Architettura e Design



