

Integrated Approaches to Dissonant Heritage of the 20th Century

with a focus on smaller towns and remote areas in Europe

Orientation Paper

in the context of the Experimental Housing and Urban Development (ExWoSt) Programme and Action 10 of the Partnership on Culture and Cultural Heritage in the Urban Agenda for the EU



Imprint

This study is part of the research project “Integrated Approaches to Dissonant Heritage in Europe” within the Experimental Housing and Urban Development (ExWoSt) programme conducted by Germany’s Federal Ministry of Housing, Urban Development and Building (BMWSB) and supervised by the Federal Institute for Research on Building, Urban Affairs and Spatial Development (BBSR) within the Federal Office for Building and Regional Planning (BBR).

The research project is being conducted in the framework of the Partnership on Culture and Cultural Heritage in the Urban Agenda for the EU (UAEU).

Project management BMWSB

Federal Ministry of Housing, Urban Development and Building
Division SW III 5 – Vibrant Communities, National Urban Development Projects
Jan Schultheiß
jan.schultheiss@bmi.bund.de

Project management BBSR

Federal Institute for Research on Building, Urban Affairs and Spatial Development
Division RS 8 – Quality in Urban Development, Investment Projects
Birgit Kann
birgit.kann@bbr.bund.de
www.dissonant-heritage.eu

Research contractor

Urban Expert, Nils Scheffler
scheffler@urbanexpert.net
In cooperation with:
location³, Dr Petra Potz
potz@location3.de
sbca, Sally Below
below@sbca.de

Authors

Nils Scheffler
Dr Petra Potz

February 2022

Cover image credits

Top from left to right:

Monument House of the Bulgarian Communist Party – Buzludzha, Kazanlak, Bulgaria, © Dora Ivanova;

Memorial site of labour camp Neuaußing, Munich, Germany, © Edward Beierle;

Chernobyl Zone, Hotel Polissya, Pripyat, Ukraine, © Yaroslav Yemelianenko

Centre from left to right:

Martyr village, Oradour-sur-Glane, France, © CMO;

Prison La Model, Barcelona, Spain, © EUROM;

Soviet Socialist architecture and urbanism, Ştei, Romania, © Ramona Novicov

Bottom from left to right:

9th Fort in Kaunas, Lithuania, © Vaidas Petrusis;

Congo monument, Brussels, Belgium, © P. Ingelaere, urban.brussels;

Concentration Camp Memorial Ebensee, Austria, © KZ Gedenkstätte Ebensee

The contents of this report reflect the views of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views of the contracting authority.



Federal Ministry
for Housing, Urban Development
and Building



Federal Institute for
Research on Building,
Urban Affairs and
Spatial Development

within the Federal Office for
Building and Regional Planning



Table of Contents

1	The Urban Agenda for the EU and Action 10 “Integrated Approaches to Dissonant Heritage”	4
1.1	Introduction to the Urban Agenda for the EU, Partnership on Culture and Cultural Heritage and Action 10	4
1.2	Focus on integrated approaches, 20th-century dissonant heritage and smaller cities and remote areas	5
2	Definitions of dissonant heritage	8
3	Knowledge gained on integrated approaches to dissonant heritage	13
3.1	Task, research questions and applied methodology	13
3.2	Stakeholder involvement and cooperation	16
3.3	Pan-European networking and cooperation	22
3.4	Public awareness	25
3.5	Financing and management	30
4	Recommendations for better knowledge, better regulation and better funding of integrated approaches to dissonant heritage	38
4.1	Better knowledge	38
4.2	Better regulation	40
4.3	Better funding	41
5	Outlook	44
5.1	Online Forum “Integrated Approaches to Europe’s Dissonant Heritage”	44
5.2	Toolbox “Integrated Approaches to Dissonant Heritage”	45
5.3	What are the next steps after the Urban Agenda for the EU?	45
6	References	48
7	Annex	49
7.1	Members of Action Group 10	49
7.2	Criteria of Action Group 10 for the selection of dissonant heritage sites for the survey	50
7.3	List of received surveys	53
7.4	Survey	55
7.5	List of case studies and interviewees	61
7.6	Interview guide for case studies	63
7.7	List of expert interviewees	64
7.8	Interview guideline for expert interviews	65



Museum of the Great War – open space in front of the museum, Péronne, France
Historial de la Grande Guerre

1 The Urban Agenda for the EU and Action 10 “Integrated Approaches to Dissonant Heritage”

Dissonant heritage sites provide important structural evidence of the complexity and sometimes controversial nature of European history and cultural heritage. They are central to the culture of remembrance as places where European history and the diverse narratives and perspectives it inspires can be experienced. They allow or call for new and changing insights and questions about our history. They encourage a critical examination of our past in order to strengthen democratic cohesion. The potential of dissonant heritage is rich and broad: for society, urban and regional development, cultural tourism and education, to name just a few.

Despite such potential, dissonant heritage sites in many parts of Europe do not receive sufficient public attention or support. They are neglected, not accessible to the public, or threatened by demolition and decay. In order to raise awareness and to develop strategies for these sites, Action 10 poses and aims to answer some key questions, among them how to deal with these historically, architecturally and culturally significant, multi-layered, often controversial and/or emotionally charged heritage sites. How can integrated approaches be used to develop and make use of their potential? How can these sites be protected and made more relevant for people today and tomorrow? What conclusions can be drawn for other heritage sites from the reflections, good practices and lessons learned?

1.1 Introduction to the Urban Agenda for the EU, Partnership on Culture and Cultural Heritage and Action 10

In the Partnership on Culture and Cultural Heritage (CCHP) in the **Urban Agenda for the EU (UAEU)** (2019–2022), **which is coordinated by Germany’s Federal Ministry for Housing, Urban Development and Building together with Italy’s National Governmental Agency for Territorial Cohesion and Ministry of Culture, dissonant heritage is one of the main topics and is addressed in more detail in a specific Action.**

One of the main starting points for **Action 10, “Integrated Approaches to Dissonant Heritage”**, was the Buzludzha monument built in the Communist era near the city of Kazanlak, Bulgaria. Early on, CCHP members asked themselves how Buzludzha, a place of historical importance for many Bulgarians, could be meaningfully linked with the other cultural treasures of the region, including the UNESCO World Heritage site of the Thracian tombs and its nationally and internationally unique tradition of growing roses and producing rose oil. What is the potential of dissonant heritage all over Europe? What challenges and obstacles become evident, especially in smaller and peripheral towns like Kazanlak? Which actors and institutions are particularly relevant and should be **involved? Starting from these considerations, the CCHP members developed “integrated approaches” to connect the dissonant heritage to urban and regional development and tourism.**

The aim of this Action is to investigate the opportunities and challenges of dissonant heritage and to increase awareness in Europe of its value and potential, especially heritage dating from the 20th century and at sites in smaller towns and remote regions. The Action also aims to promote greater integration of dissonant heritage in urban and regional development and consequently to help conserve it and ensure that it is viably developed: from the European experience within the UAEU and its multi-level governance approach, this integrated, place-based approach has the potential to expand perspectives and bring together different forces. Another objective of the Action is to promote better use of the potential of the heritage for purposes such as education in history and democracy and the development of tourism.

The implementation of the Action by CCHP members and external assisting bodies (under the oversight of **Germany’s Federal Ministry for Housing, Urban Development and Building is supported by the research project “Integrated Approaches to Dissonant Heritage in Europe” within Germany’s Federal *Experimental Housing and Urban Development* (ExWoSt) programme.** The implementation is supported by an Action Group of experts and practitioners from the cultural heritage sector across Europe (7.1) and a research consortium of urban experts commissioned by the Federal Institute for Research on Building, Urban Affairs and Spatial Development (BBSR). This Orientation Paper summarises the results of the research project.

The UAEU represents a new multi-level working method promoting cooperation between European Union Member States, regions, cities, the European Commission and other stakeholders. Since the Pact of Amsterdam established the Urban Agenda for the EU in 2016, thematic partnerships with specific actions have been launched in order to stimulate growth, liveability and innovation in the cities of Europe and to identify and successfully tackle societal challenges. Each UAEU Partnership is expected to explore new paths and to test and develop innovative approaches to address urban issues and challenges and ultimately to formulate specific policy recommendations for the EU, its Member States and municipalities to improve knowledge, regulation and funding in this field.

Institutional framework



Framework of the study within the UAEU Partnership and Action 10
 Own illustration/BMWSB/BBSR

1.2 Focus on integrated approaches, 20th-century dissonant heritage and smaller cities and remote areas

The interpretation of our dissonant past is a complex yet worthwhile task which requires continuous reflection on the pillars of our contemporary democratic society. And broad and integrated approaches that involve all relevant stakeholders and sectors and that relate the heritage to urban development can unveil and develop the potential of dissonant heritage and capture its historical significance.

These integrated approaches not only include cross-sector activities but also outline a broader definition of

- different layers, values and perspectives of heritage,
- different disciplinary connections: heritage studies, cultural policies, social and public history, ethnography, anthropology, political science, planning, architecture, sociology, community-led development, pedagogy, etc.,
- different fields of heritage action: protection, research, museums, documentation, management, education,
- different spheres of actors concerned with heritage: public, private, civic,
- different levels of action: local, regional, national, European and international.



Saaleck Workshops, designed by anti-Semite and racial ideologist Paul-Schultze Naumburg, used by the Nazi elite as a think tank, Germany
Falko Matte, Marzona Stiftung Neue Saalecker Werkstätten

As mentioned above, the Action focuses on the dissonant heritage of the 20th century, when most European countries experienced radical political transformation, totalitarian regimes, or dictatorships and wars, raising questions about national identity as well as political and cultural borders. Throughout Europe, dissonant heritage sites with buildings and ensembles of cultural significance represent this multi-layered and controversial history of the 20th century. Among them are heritage sites associated with National Socialist, Fascist, nationalist or socialist regimes and state systems as well as places and structural evidence of war, persecution, colonisation or propaganda. In addition, architecturally striking buildings and ensembles of post-war modernism are often also perceived as “difficult” or “dissonant”.

The Action is particularly innovative by focusing on exploring the specific framework conditions, such as local budgets, personnel, access, or tourism, in smaller cities and remote areas in Europe dealing with dissonant heritage sites. The Action considers their similar and differing circumstances and strategic approaches as compared to large cities, which present both challenges and opportunities. Consequently, Action 10 pays special attention to the situation of sites and monuments in smaller and peripheral places throughout Europe in order to explore what kind of public and political attention and support these heritage sites require to fulfil their important function of strengthening democracy and urban and regional development.

The Action also aims to focus on lesser known and less developed/explored dissonant heritage sites, where the Action could have an impact and support local activities. It thus chose to leave out internationally known examples of dissonant heritage, such as Auschwitz, the Nazi Party Rally Grounds in Nuremberg, the Victory Monument in Bolzano and the Mostar Bridge. Nevertheless, many of these places, too, face questions about their future development and require increased attention and support.



Monument House of the Bulgarian Communist Party – Buzludzha, Kazanlak, Bulgaria
Dora Ivanova

2 Definitions of dissonant heritage

Different terms, typologies and categories are used to describe potentially problematic or controversial heritage sites. The study explored these definitions and understandings on various levels; a summary is given here.

In her paper, “Approaches to memory in dealing with difficult/dissonant heritage”, commissioned by the Urban Agenda Technical Secretariat, Anna Bull emphasises a multi-perspective approach to dissonant heritage which includes “controversial, unsettling and undesirable perspectives as much as possible, in order to ‘teach conflict’ and promote critical reflection.” Dissonance can have a positive role “in challenging established and hegemonic discourses and allowing for that peaceful contestation of values and meanings which is at the basis of democratic coexistence.” (Bull 2021)

Expert interviews were conducted during the research. Many of the experts interviewed on their understanding of dissonant heritage highlighted the diversity of competing meanings and uses within a dynamic process of re-interpretation and referred to the concept of Tunbridge/Ashworth (1996), who describe dissonant heritage as actively being contested, multi-layered with meanings and values inscribed by different actors that are not in consonance with each other or even in conflict. The authors make a crucial distinction between past, history and heritage: from “what has happened” to history as “selective attempts to describe this past” and heritage as “a contemporary product shaped from history”, underlining the importance of the interpretive process inherent to dissonant heritage.

In the context of dissonant heritage, a rich academic debate has developed which uses a variety of terms, for example “difficult heritage”, “dark heritage” or “contentious heritage” (Macdonald 2009; Eckersley 2020, TRACES 2019), emphasising special categories of heritage. Further, based on recent experience in south-eastern Europe, “heritage dissonance” (Kisić 2016) can be considered a quality in all kinds of heritage even if it is not disputed at the moment. Any kind of cultural heritage can be dissonant depending on its reception and at different points in time.

In the course of the study, case studies indicated that some dissonant heritage sites are associated with controversial narratives and interpretations – both positive and negative. One example is the imperial district in Poznan, Poland, whose history can be divided into three periods. In the first period, 1905–1914, Poland’s Prussian occupiers constructed new, representative buildings (among others a castle) with the idea of developing Poznan into an eastern German capital and establishing a German presence there. In the second period, during the Second World War, the castle was rebuilt as a potential residence for Adolf Hitler and ultimately used by the Nazi Gauleiter Arthur Greiser. In the third period, the imperial district was the scene of protests by workers in 1956 and by students and supporters of the Solidarnosc movement in the 1970s and 1980s in the struggle for Polish freedom and independence from the Soviet Union. Today, the imperial district is mainly perceived as an important symbol of this struggle. The buildings (from the Prussian era) are recognised as important cultural heritage of the city and are used by public, academic and cultural institutions.

In the context of this study, dissonant heritage refers in particular to cultural and architectural heritage which evokes unpleasant memories and associations for society or for particular social groups and/or which is perceived as politically and/or ethically tainted. “Dissonant” in this sense is not regarded as an innate characteristic of the heritage but must always be understood in a larger social, political and historical context.



Imperial district – aerial view of the castle, Poznan, Poland
Maciej Kaczyński

The Action Group distinguished the following types of monuments and sites affected by dissonance:

- built under fascism, Nazism, communism, colonialism and other eras
- related to war and violence
- related to persecution and resistance
- single isolated monument or ensemble or heritage area or cultural landscape
- building with potential internal uses (religious, civil events)
- places of worship, detention/concentration camps
- industrial buildings and surrounding areas
- parks, gardens and recreational landscapes
- cemeteries and burial grounds
- battlefields
- entire village massacred
- archaeological traces

In addition, the study suggests dividing dissonant heritage sites into different categories, such as places

- which are dominated by atrocities, e.g. concentration camps,
- which are representative or symbols of an oppressive system, but where no atrocities took place, for example the Monument House of the Bulgarian Communist Party – Buzludzha in Kazanlak, Bulgaria,
- where positive events **have overshadowed the “difficult” ones**, for example the imperial district in Poznan, Poland.

Concentration camp Buchenwald –
camp gate, Weimar, Germany
Naomi Tereza Salmon, Buchenwald
Memorial Collection



Socialist foundation of an industrial city
– ceramic composition in the town hall
of Dimitrovgrad, Bulgaria
ATRIUM Archive



Central animal laboratories of the Freie
Universität Berlin ("Mice bunker"),
Germany
Felix Torkar



Furthermore, a distinction can be made according to the intensity of contestation, such as places

- where dissonance is remembered and consciously dealt with and
- where the dissonance has been forgotten, is suppressed or is only presented in a one-sided manner.

The different types of monuments and sites, the background and intensity of contestation and the development phases of dissonant heritage sites are important aspects and framework conditions to be taken into consideration for the implementation of integrated approaches.



Borderland trail, Borderland museum Eichsfeld, Germany
Grenzlandmuseum Eichsfeld



Stasi Headquarters, Campus for Democracy – summer theatre, Berlin, Germany
BStU/Stasi-Unterlagen-Archiv

3 Knowledge gained on integrated approaches to dissonant heritage

All (percentage) figures in this document refer to the results of the survey carried out with dissonant heritage sites in smaller towns and remote areas in Europe.

3.1 Task, research questions and applied methodology

Task

The aim of Action 10 is to raise awareness of the value and potential of dissonant heritage in Europe, especially dissonant heritage of the 20th century in smaller cities and peripheral areas. The Action aims to integrate this dissonant heritage more closely with urban and regional development and thus help to protect it and ensure its sustainable development, while better utilising its potential, for example in teaching history, strengthening democracy and developing tourism.

In the spirit of the Urban Agenda for the EU (UAEU), the Action aims to test and develop new and innovative approaches to urban issues which ultimately form the basis for recommendations for action addressed to the European Commission. The Action is being carried out by members of the Partnership on Culture and Cultural Heritage (CCHP) and by external supporters under the auspices of Germany's Federal Ministry for Housing, Urban Development and Building (BMWSB) with the support of the Federal Institute for Research on Building, Urban Affairs and Spatial Development (BBSR), and its implementation is supported by the research project.

The research project aims to investigate how integrated approaches can be used to develop and harness the potential of dissonant heritage for society, urban and regional development and (cultural) tourism. The aim of the research project is to identify and demonstrate approaches, strategies and solutions for dealing with dissonant heritage and its sustainable development and use in different (socio-) spatial contexts and European countries. In doing so, both the relevant stakeholders to be involved and the appropriate instruments, methods and procedures are to be considered.

Main research topics and questions

The research project is defined by the above-mentioned framework, with a focus on integrated approaches, on smaller towns and remote areas and the heritage of the 20th century. Within this framework, the following research topics and questions help to guide the study:

- **Variations of understanding “dissonant heritage”**
What is meant by dissonant heritage in Europe? Are there different types of dissonant heritage?
- **Obstacles to and potential for the integrated use and development of dissonant heritage sites**
What is the significance and potential of dissonant heritage sites with regard to strengthening cities and regions, (cultural) tourism, democracy and identity-building in Europe? What potential and obstacles are evident in different regions and countries in Europe?
- **Approaches, instruments and procedures for the integrated use and development of dissonant heritage**
Which integrated approaches and strategies are suitable for dealing with dissonant heritage in order to promote its functions for (urban) society, urban and regional development as well as (cultural) tourism and to initiate sustainable use? What participatory approaches for handling dissonant heritage sites and issues are there, particularly in relation to contested sites and competing memories? What tools, methods and procedures are available to the different stakeholders? At what stages can municipalities play a key role?
- **Stakeholder involvement and financial support dealing with, and integrated development of, the dissonant heritage**
Which stakeholders and institutions are relevant when dealing with integrated approaches to dissonant heritage sites? How can their networks be improved? What funding options can be used to deal with dissonant heritage and its preservation and development?



Vogelsang IP –training centre for the offspring of the NSDAP leadership cadre, Schleiden, Germany
Vogelsang IP

Methodology


In order to answer these questions and to gain an overview of dissonant heritage sites in smaller European towns and remote regions, including the characteristics of these sites, their funding, their stakeholders and the potential of integrated approaches to deal with and develop dissonant heritage in Europe, the study was carried out in 2021 using a mix of methodological elements:

- **an online survey** (see 7.4) coordinated with the Action Group was sent to 49 heritage sites, mainly in smaller and remote towns in Europe, which the Action Group selected as particularly relevant for the study (for the selection criteria of the Action Group, see 7.1) (40 completed surveys were returned, 7.3),
- **42 interviews in selected case studies** were conducted with local stakeholders involved in managing and implementing integrated approaches to dissonant heritage sites in smaller and remote towns (7.5) following an interview guide (7.6),
- **ten interviews from a strategic perspective** were conducted with European experts having an academic and institutional background (7.7) on their experiences and personal assessments of integrated approaches to dissonant heritage following a qualitative interview guide (7.6),
- **an international expert workshop** with 45 participants was organised to reflect on the results of the empirical work of the research project and to discuss and develop recommendations for integrated approaches in dealing with dissonant heritage.

This orientation paper summarises the main findings of the survey, the local case study interviews, the expert interviews and the international expert workshop under four main headings:

- **Stakeholder involvement and cooperation** (3.2)
- **Pan-European networking and cooperation** (3.3)
- **Public awareness** (3.4)
- **Financing and management** (3.5)

Based on the main findings, in chapter 4 recommendations at strategic and operational level are presented in line with the three principles of the UAEU: Better knowledge – Better regulation – Better funding.



Map of the dissonant heritage sites that participated in the survey and case studies
BBSR

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1 Adolf Hitler's birthplace, Braunau, Austria | 21 Historical Olympic Village of 1936, Wustermark |
| 2 Concentration Camp Memorial Ebensee, Austria | 22 Memorial site of former labour camp Neuaubing, Munich, Germany |
| 3 Atlantikwall Raversyde, Oostende, Belgium | 23 Peenemünde Test Centre, Germany |
| 4 Colonial symbols in public spaces, Brussels capital region, Belgium | 24 Planned city Eisenhüttenstadt, Germany |
| 5 Decolonising public space; statue of King Leopold II of Belgium at the historic city hall, Leuven, Belgium | 25 Remembrance, education and meeting centre, Alt Rehse, Germany |
| 6 Monument House of the Bulgarian Communist Party - Buzludzha, Kazanlak, Bulgaria | 26 Saaleck Workshops, Saaleck, Germany |
| 7 Neoclassical type architecture, Dimitrovgrad, Bulgaria | 27 Stasi Headquarters. Campus for Democracy, Berlin, Germany |
| 8 Jasenovac Concentration Camp Memorial Site, Croatia | 28 Vogelsang IP (Internationaler Platz), Schleiden, Germany |
| 9 Ustasha Concentration Camp Slana, Island of Pag, Croatia | 29 Dunaújváros downtown and Technikum district, Hungary |
| 10 The Green Line, United Nations Buffer Zone, Cyprus | 30 Historic centre built during the Fascist dictatorship, Forlì, Italy |
| 11 City Hall, Tallinn, Estonia | 31 Permanent exhibition within the Monument of Victory, Bolzano, Italy |
| 12 Concentration Camp Natzweiler-Struthof, France and its secondary camps in Germany | 32 9th Fort in Kaunas, Lithuania |
| 13 Martyr village, Oradour-sur-Glane, France | 33 Central Post Office Skopje, North Macedonia |
| 14 Museums of the History of the Great War, Peronne/Thiepval, France | 34 Maze Long Kesh, Lisburn, Northern Ireland |
| 15 Rivesaltes Camp Memorial, France | 35 Nowa Huta, Kraków, Poland |
| 16 Shoah Memorial, Paris/Drancy, France | 36 Imperial District, Poznań, Poland |
| 17 Borderland Museum, Eichsfeld, Germany | 37 Memorial to the Victims of Communism and the Resistance, Sighet, Romania |
| 18 Buchenwald Memorial and Mittelbau-Dora Concentration Camp Memorial, Germany | 38 Soviet Socialist architecture and urbanism, Ștei, Romania |
| 19 Central Animal Laboratories of the Freie Universität Berlin ("Mice bunker"), Germany | 39 La Model, Barcelona, Spain |
| 20 Great goat mountain, Ballenstedt, Germany | 40 Sites and objects, Chernobyl Zone, Ukraine |
| | 41 Valley of the Fallen, El Escorial, Spain |


3.2 Stakeholder involvement and cooperation

Dissonant heritage sites, in particular those in smaller towns and remote areas, need broad support in order to protect and develop these sites sustainably and in an integrated way which recognises their heritage and historical significance and their possible functions. Protecting and developing such sites requires the involvement and cooperation of relevant stakeholders, and integrated approaches can help. The study therefore looks at the state of stakeholder involvement and cooperation and the potential of dissonant heritage sites. The following chapter summarises the main findings from the survey, the case studies, the expert interviews and the expert workshop.

3.2.1 Main findings of the survey

Political support

The large majority of those responsible for heritage sites who responded to the survey stated that the sites received political support, mainly from the local level, but also to a large extent from the national and regional level. Slightly more than half receive support from only one level, in most cases from the local one. But receiving support does not mean support from every political party, nor does it mean that they receive a great deal of support. The surveys also show that political preferences and priorities change, resulting in more or less support for dissonant heritage sites.



89 % of heritage sites receive political support, which consists of:


- emphasis on the value of the historical site in public
- general support for activities carried out at the heritage site
- financial support
- participation in round tables, workshops and planning processes related to the development of the site
- membership in boards

Civic support

The large majority of those who responded to the survey stated that they received civic support, mainly from the local level, but also from the national and regional level. Slightly more than half receive support from only one level, either the local or the national one.

86 % of heritage sites receive civic support, which consists of:

- taking care of monuments, minor maintenance
- supporting the remembrance work: contributing to exhibitions, witness testimonies
- offering guided tours
- supporting membership
- collaborating in projects with artists, craftspersons and researchers on the use of the site, cultural events, activities to valorise/remember/raise awareness of the heritage site




Activities in stakeholder involvement

One survey question asked about stakeholders and what kind of activities they are involved in. In general, all groups of stakeholders are involved in activities concerning the dissonant heritage, but regional and national governments are involved to a lesser extent, while companies are only involved to a small extent:

- **Owners** (in the form of dialogue and information) **and local governments** (in the form of dialogue, information, co-design and co-decision-making) are highly involved in most of the activities concerning the dissonant heritage site.
- **Citizens, local initiatives, NGOs and foundations** are highly involved in events, outreach/education and networking (in the form of dialogue and information).
- **Academic organisations** are mainly involved in events and outreach/education (in the form of dialogue and information).
- **People affected by the dissonant heritage** are mainly involved in events (in the form of information and dialogue).
- **Regional governments** are mainly involved in preservation and maintenance, events and exchange/networking (in the form of dialogue).
- **National governments** are mainly involved in preservation and maintenance (in the form of dialogue).

Stakeholder groups that have started activities around the dissonant heritage

The survey asked which stakeholder groups had started activities concerning the dissonant heritage. The main stakeholder groups here are the local governments, people affected by the dissonant heritage and citizens/local initiatives. They seem to be important drivers for initiating action on dissonant heritage sites.



Peenemünde Army Research Centre –
Students of an international summer camp
caring for the ruins in the Peenemünde
monument landscape, Germany
HTM Peenemünde



3.2.2 Main findings of the case studies

Dissonant heritage sites that are “managed” by public independent organisations cooperate more often with the research community (universities and experts), often on a voluntary basis. Sites that are managed by public dependent organisations cooperate more often with school institutions and local, regional or national government.

The intensity of the cooperation depends on the budget provided for the cooperation.

Benefits of stakeholder involvement

In the case studies, a number of benefits resulting from stakeholder involvement with dissonant heritage sites were mentioned.

In particular these benefits result from active involvement of stakeholders in:

- reflecting on the dissonant heritage and its significance
- conflict resolution and in curating the multiple perspectives on the dissonant heritage site
- sharing ideas and thoughts in open dialogue about the handling of the dissonant heritage site and developing joint propositions and projects for integrated approaches
- local events involving dissonant heritage sites

The involvement and cooperation can:

- create personal contacts that are helpful in developing joint projects
- open new doors for funding as further funding programmes can be used
- create new ideas for handling the dissonant heritage site as new perspectives come in
- **gain new ‘local ambassadors’ who help preserve** the dissonant heritage site
- strengthen the general commitment and understanding, contributing to the acceptance of proposals and decisions and realisation of independent and bottom-up activities

In the case study interviews, the following areas in which stakeholder groups participate were stressed:

- **Education:** educational institutions, in particular schools, museums, associations of victims, eyewitnesses and their relatives, universities, local government
- **Tourism:** (associations of) guides, local and regional tourism offices
- **Culture:** cultural centres, artists
- **Research:** universities, national and international experts
- **Management:** local and regional government; advisory boards with different stakeholders
- **Preservation:** governments, national and international experts

3.2.3 Main findings of the expert interviews

The expert interviews showed that perspectives on cultural heritage often reflect a single discipline, ranging from history, art history and architecture to archaeology, etc., ensuring deep understanding and expertise in these fields. But these specialists usually have little training in or experience with interdisciplinary activities or in reaching out to other stakeholders within integrated approaches.

Some of the experts interviewed underscored the importance of a multi-faceted perspective and of including other fields, especially for such an interdisciplinary subject as dissonant heritage, which is often a subject of ideological or simplifying debates. Some projects involving school pupils or university students have demonstrated the educational impact when dissonant heritage can be connected to their daily lives and current events.

This requires knowledge and skills from other disciplines, other methods and tools, other approaches than the usual ones, and a multidisciplinary approach including creative industries, digitalisation, and educational and design-based methods.



Franco-era mass graves on Barcelona's Montjuic cemetery – site visit of the Action Group 10, Spain
Teresa Estrada

3.2.4 Main findings of the expert workshop

In the working group “Stakeholder involvement and cooperation” during the expert workshop, the participants discussed a variety of issues, summarised in the following main findings.

1. Different perspectives, narratives and emotions are part of dissonant heritage sites. It is necessary to facilitate, but not to try to resolve them

Dissonant heritage sites may evoke a strong emotional response. Emotions are therefore part of dissonant heritage sites; they cannot and should not be “erased”, but if necessary moderated to a level that makes it possible to discuss different perspectives. Alternatively, a new approach which looks at the different perspectives and allows a different type of discourse/focus needs to be developed.

2. Different perspectives and narratives should be put in context based on a firm foundation of knowledge

The perspectives and narratives need to be contextualised on the basis of facts (firm scientific knowledge base). This can help to rule out perspectives which do not have a provable or reliable background and avoid providing an uncritical platform.

3. Stakeholders should be involved in the interpretation of the site, and groups with different perspectives should be consulted

To ensure an open dialogue about different perspectives and narratives and to be able to integrate them in the interpretation of the dissonant heritage site, it is important to reach out actively to groups with different perspectives – based on the scientific findings and context. To do so, potential barriers to the participation of stakeholders need to be identified and addressed. The dialogue should strengthen the values of democracy and the rule of law.

4. Clearly defined budget for participatory and cooperation activities

Stakeholder involvement and cooperation and the implementation of related activities and projects as outcome of the process take time, staff and financial resources. These should be secured at an early stage.

5. Transparent participatory approaches and cooperation based on clarity about the roles, rules and trajectory

Starting with a clear explanation of the roles of each stakeholder involved and the rules of involvement is recommended. Participants must agree to them to be allowed to participate. To avoid misunderstandings and false expectations, it is crucial to explain the purpose of the involvement and cooperation and what is and is not allowed.

6. Ensuring ownership of ideas and results of participation and cooperation

To ensure that stakeholders support the implementation of projects and activities that arise from involvement and cooperation, it is necessary to ensure ownership of the results and the financial resources for their implementation. Developing shared ideas and projects dealing with dissonance and carrying them out together can help in this regard.

7. Scaling up, ensuring continuous cooperation, creating trust


One way to build trust can be to start with smaller or less contested topics. Based on successful participatory processes and cooperation, further involvement and activities or permanent structures (i.e. committee, steering group) can be created to ensure ongoing cooperation. This will increase the level of trust between stakeholders and the base of supporters.

3.2.5 Main conclusions regarding the following research questions

Which stakeholders and institutions are relevant when dealing with integrated approaches to dissonant heritage sites? How can integrated approaches encourage their involvement and cooperation?

Integrated approaches allow different stakeholders and institutions to collaborate on the development and use of dissonant heritage sites. In this way, more stakeholders can be reached and motivated to work together on the dissonant heritage site.

A large majority of survey respondents (92 %) stated that their dissonant heritage was linked to other topics, mainly to arts and culture as well as to education and tourism. Within these fields they also saw further potential for development, particularly by establishing a link to tourism and education/memory, but also by making the **site's relevance for daily life** clearer and showing additional time layers and perspectives of the dissonant heritage.



Doing so offers opportunities for cooperation with artists, cultural institutions and creative industry; with schools, universities and other educational institutions; and with local and regional tourism offices, agencies and guides. At many dissonant heritage sites, more research is needed. Here, experts and academic organisations such as universities are important cooperation partners.

The remembrance, information and education work at dissonant heritage sites also facilitates cooperation with affected groups (who make important contributions in the form of stories and personal engagement), interested citizens, associations and initiatives concerned with the dissonant topic – not only locally. These actors are often involved as volunteers who are highly committed and motivated but have limited time and need professional guidance and coordination. These actors often provide valuable assistance with the following activities, especially when financial resources are scarce:

- minor maintenance
- support for remembrance work (outreach/education), contributing to exhibitions and with witness testimonies
- guided tours
- membership and lobbying
- collaboration in projects with artists, craftsmen and researchers

For some remote dissonant heritage sites, it is difficult to find supporters and partners in large numbers to establish partnerships from local to international level. Especially at the beginning, diverse stakeholders are needed to initiate action on dissonant heritage sites and bring them to the attention of the public. In the survey, local decision-makers, people affected, local initiatives and committed citizens were named as the most important groups.

In general, however, it was noted that the cooperation and involvement of stakeholders greatly depends on the general political and civic attitudes towards the dissonance of the heritage site. The more contested the site, the more difficult it is to establish lasting cooperation for integrated approaches and with citizens, as the supportive framework to deal with the dissonance might be lacking. Certain prerequisites, in particular willingness to deal with the dissonant heritage and financial resources for preserving the dissonant heritage site, are needed to build stable cooperation for integrated approaches.



Successful cooperation also requires continuity, transparency, trust and shared goals among stakeholders. A clear idea of what the dissonant heritage site means is necessary to be able to convince people to collaborate on it. This idea must be precisely articulated to ensure that potential partners fully understand what cooperation entails. Cooperation requires sufficient staff resources, financing, time and continuity – resources which are often in short supply.

3.3 Pan-European networking and cooperation

Dissonant heritage sites, in particular those in smaller towns and remote areas, do not always receive the appropriate attention and support they need to safeguard and develop these sites sustainably and in an integrated way. In some cases, experience and expertise in dealing with dissonant heritage sites are also lacking. Transnational networks **may enable network partners to learn from others’ experience, discuss practices and approaches**, gather new ideas and work together on issues relevant for dissonant heritage sites. Transnational networks may also enable organisations, initiatives and individuals responsible for or interested in dissonant heritage to approach their site from a pan-European perspective in a comparative framework. This potential for valorising, promoting and reflecting on dissonant heritage needs to be further explored. The following chapter summarises the main findings from the survey, the case studies, the expert interviews and the expert workshop with regard to transnational networks.

3.3.1 Main findings of the survey

In their survey responses, most of those responsible for dissonant heritage sites (79 %) stated that they communicated and cooperated at national, European or regional levels with other heritage sites and initiatives.



Topics dissonant heritage sites would like to exchange and network on
Own illustration

3.3.2 Main findings of the case studies

The case study interviews noted the following benefits of participating in pan-European networks and projects in particular: such networks and projects

- raise the profile of the dissonant heritage site at the international level;
- increase awareness of the dissonance and provide a tool for reflecting on local dissonant heritage from a perspective different from the local or regional one. In this way, it is possible to overcome localism, end ideological routines or taboos, create new local alliances, introduce new perspectives to the local debate, gain political support and inspire people at the local level to address the dissonant heritage;
- increase knowledge about other dissonant heritage sites in Europe and bring together like-minded people and institutions to share ideas and inspire new ones, work together on joint projects and discover new perspectives and approaches to addressing dissonance;
- help in **learning not to be ashamed of one's own history and its heritage and to speak about both the positive and negative aspects.**

3.3.3 Main findings of the expert interviews

The expert interviews identified the following strategic leverage effects of participating in pan-European networks and projects:

- elaborating common positions on European identity while maintaining cultural diversity;
- improving European visibility for potential topics and funding for dissonant heritage;
- making use of the European perspective: cultural routes thematising heritage make heritage sites accessible for people, especially when they are created at a grassroots level and include villages and small towns. Their inclusion in wider networks makes them visible and expands possibilities for reflection;
- European networking on dissonant heritage is essential. Coordination and network activities are professional activities and need to be funded;
- pioneering new, adaptive reuse of dissonant heritage sites and looking for funding together because of the additional weight lent by involvement in a network.

3.3.4 Main findings of the expert workshop

In the working group “Pan-European networking and cooperation” during the expert workshop, the participants discussed a variety of issues summarised in the following main statements.

1. A network of networks is needed: more communication, promotion and expansion of the different pan-European networks

There are several pan-European networks but only small expert groups. The existing networks connect different kinds of stakeholders: experts, local authorities/municipalities, sites, educators, researchers, etc. A platform would be desirable that unites all these types of stakeholders who can then interact and collaborate with each other: a network of networks.

2. Why network on dissonant heritage

Every nation has dissonant heritage and a difficult past, and networking highlights what the different contexts have in common. Instead of feeling ashamed, people have more incentive to work together for common goals which reflect the European values of human rights, public participation, and the rule of law. More knowledge and exchange are therefore needed to share a painful past and to put it into a larger context. Networks should recognise the value of discussion and should involve political leaders. Networks should foster mutual learning and encourage an assessment of own actions instead of focusing on **presenting one's own institution.**

Dissonant heritage might help inspire a lively discussion about what is going on in society. Transparency and inclusion of relevant stakeholders and marginalised voices are also very important to the success of an existing network.

3. Themes and topics for the network

The value of conflict and of different perspectives should be recognised as a central part of education for democracy. It is important to network on dissonant heritage so that democracy can be cherished. Networks on dissonant heritage also help participants to learn from the past, to interpret it in the context of dissonant heritage and to find a way to promote democracy.

4. Framework conditions

Networks require a key message/vision to share which recognises the importance of dissonant heritage and its value for discussion supporting democratic culture (rule of law, participation, human rights). It is also necessary to include multiple stakeholders at different levels and institutions to ensure that a wide range of disciplines is represented, with participants ranging from authorities to researchers and educators, as well as members of marginalised groups.

3.3.5 Main conclusions regarding the following research questions

What role can dissonant heritage sites play in strengthening cities and regions, (cultural) tourism, democracy and identity-building in Europe? What potential and obstacles are evident in different European regions and countries? What can transnational cooperation and networks offer? How can they be further developed using integrated approaches?

Transnational cooperation networks help to draw both local and international attention to (less well-known) dissonant heritage sites. In particular, they broaden the local perspectives on the dissonant heritage sites, bringing to light not only the dissonance, but also the cultural value of the place and other narratives related to the site. This helps to increase public and civic support for and engagement with the site. Further, transnational networks help in sharing information and experience regarding the management and (integrated) development of dissonant heritage sites. They enable organisations, initiatives and individuals responsible for or interested in dissonant heritage to approach the topic from a pan-European perspective in a comparative framework, valorising, promoting and reflecting on the dissonant heritage.

According to the survey, participants in cross-border networks are interested in the thematic areas of linking dissonant heritage to other topics and fields, in funding and management of dissonant heritage sites, and in stakeholder involvement and awareness raising. Transnational cooperation which provides new and unexpected insights and perspectives can also yield potential for integrated approaches to deepen thematic linkages and create synergies. The cross-cutting dimension of pan-European networking could receive much more emphasis.

Transnational cooperation is initiated and strongly supported by EU programmes, which influence the type and nature of cooperation and networking through their funding schemes. In the case studies, INTERREG, Cultural Routes of the Council of Europe, the European Heritage Label and programmes promoting thematic exchange and cooperation between institutions (Europe for Citizens programme) were mentioned. In one case study, international cooperation was promoted by an international organisation (ICOMOS).

But nearly half of the cases studied are not involved in transnational cooperation or networking. The reasons differ depending on the local situation, and the interviews did not identify any reasons that applied in every case. Some of the reasons mentioned were a lack of site management, networking on a regional or national level, or a lack of political will to deal with dissonance.

The case studies showed that EU programmes are an important incentive for transnational cooperation. These should be maintained and expanded. At the same time, EU funding programmes are seen as administratively burdensome, complex and inflexible, which discourages some actors, in particular smaller entities in charge of dissonant heritage sites, from participating in cooperation projects.

An international exchange platform is seen as an important tool for transnational cooperation: as a way to find partners, develop common project ideas, discuss dissonance without local or national bias, and share ideas about the significance of local dissonant heritage sites.

3.4 Public awareness


Dissonant heritage sites, in particular in smaller towns and remote areas, do not always receive the attention and support they need to safeguard and develop these sites sustainably and in an integrated way. For dissonant heritage sites, it is important not only to preserve the physical heritage. What is particularly important about these sites is remembering, communicating and teaching what the sites stand for and what history(s) they commemorate. The preservation of buildings and structures is an important means to this end and needs to be aligned with this main task. The study explored how integrated approaches can help to raise awareness and better communicate what the place stands for and to develop their remembrance, communication, education and cultural functions, among others. The following chapter summarises the main findings from the survey, the case studies, the expert interviews and the expert workshop.



Buchenwald Memorial – exhibition special camp, Weimar, Germany
Peter Hansen, Buchenwald Memorial Collection

3.4.1 Main findings of the survey

Public awareness was a very limited focus of the survey. One question asked about the communication and outreach channels to inform the (interested) public about the dissonant heritage site and activities there.



Communication and outreach channels used by dissonant heritage sites
Own illustration

At the same time, educational activities (that also serve to raise awareness) take place at many of the dissonant heritage sites. These are activities like annual ceremonies to remember the victims, open days with other cultural institutions, cooperation with schools and universities, guided tours and walks, educational workshops/seminars, European student programmes (Erasmus+) and the creation of the site as a place of discussion and discourse.

3.4.2 Main findings of the case studies

Dissonant heritage sites are well suited to conveying in a tangible and authentic way what happened at the site and how it has been interpreted. They can be the public arena for a discourse about the different perspectives and narratives on the dissonance. As eyewitnesses die out, such places can keep the authentic memory and commemorative work alive, in particular for the younger generation.

The case study interviews showed that linking the dissonant heritage site to other topics and sectors (a key part of the integrated approaches) can raise public awareness and enrich the discourse about the dissonant heritage site. Doing so

- opens up a variety of ways to direct attention to the site and to access and engage with the dissonance, promote communication, convey, mediate and discuss contested history and events,
- fosters different ways of looking at dissonant heritage sites, what they represent and the fact that they contain interesting aspects worth preserving and remembering,
- can promote discussions about the future use of the site (for an appropriate purpose).

Involving national and international experts in activities to increase public awareness and discourse adds new perspectives and attitudes towards the dissonant heritage site to those held by the society and responsible institutions.

3.4.3 Main findings of the expert interviews

The culture of critical discourse concerning **one's own history varies across Europe**. Accordingly, the experts interviewed identified a broad range of attitudes towards public awareness and the discussion of dissonant heritage. A lively political and civic culture is essential to promote a public discourse on the dissonance of heritage sites. Dissonant heritage is a concern not only for the people who live near such sites, but also for those far away. Further, it varies depending on how the discourse is constituted, by whom and who has a voice. Long-term efforts are needed to create public awareness of a dissonant heritage site that allows for a discussion free of ideological bias and that foregrounds the usefulness and relevance of debate (for example to strengthen democracy). For this reason, political support is essential.

The expert interviews noted the importance of involving and cooperating with different stakeholders at local and regional level and of finding new and creative ways to raise awareness. One practice that was suggested is putting dissonant heritage in the middle of the public arena. Instead of turning sites into museums or removing contested statues or signs, as has recently been observed in the post-colonialism debate, it can be more productive to comment on this dissonant heritage using counter-monuments and arts interventions (as in the case of the war memorial in Hamburg-Dammtor or the bas-relief on the former Fascist Party building Casa del Fascio in Bolzano). The effect is to reconcile different interests: the interest in protecting the monument and preserving the heritage, on the one hand, and the interest in providing re-contextualisation and historical classification in line with current societal attitudes on the other hand. The dissonance remains, with a visible contemporary position.

Another suggestion from the experts when dissonance arises from the memories of different groups of people about the same place (as in the Protestant and Catholic communities of Northern Ireland) is to bring together people from different communities to talk about their memories and tell the history of a place from their own personal perspectives. The perspectives will continue to differ, but people learn to listen to the other perspective and accept its existence.

In the case of Forlì, Italy, **participation in the Council of Europe's ATRIUM Cultural Route (Architecture of Totalitarian Regimes in Europe's Urban Memory) has ended a taboo on talking about the city's Fascist heritage**. It proved to be the right strategic and political moment and the right alliance to start working and reflecting on this heritage, and it was possible to overcome entrenched ideological positions. Knowing more about the dissonant heritage has made the place much more attractive and interesting to residents and visitors even if the stories from the past are painful. People used the buildings (cinema, school, railway station, post office) without thinking about their history, but after this intense communication process the dissonance will be impossible to ignore.



Forlì's historic centre built during the Fascist dictatorship – flight mosaics in the former military College of Aeronautics, Italy
Luca Massari

3.4.4 Main findings of the expert workshop

In the working group “Public awareness” during the expert workshop, the participants discussed a variety of issues, which the moderation team summarised in the following main findings.

1. Clear idea of the nature of the dissonant heritage site

To be able to raise public awareness, it is essential to have a clear idea of the nature of the dissonant heritage site, especially the specific kind of dissonance. The suggestion is to work on this idea and articulate clear connections to the present to create awareness.

2. Cycles of raising public awareness

There is no defined moment to raise awareness about a dissonant heritage site. It is an ongoing process of positioning and debating on a multi-layered memory in the public domain. There can be several moments in time when different groups have drawn attention to the site which have to be taken into consideration. One should be careful not to choose one dominant moment and neglect the others. In any case, it is necessary to take action to prevent further damage to the site.

3. Public debate on dissonant heritage

The idea of dissonant heritage is widely accepted in society. This does not mean that the definition of dissonant heritage is the same everywhere. It is important to listen to different voices and provide a forum for a public debate which includes multiple perspectives.

Ways have to be identified to motivate local communities to participate in reflecting on dissonant heritage and to make use of oral history and participatory approaches which include many groups. The debate should also be extended to the national level to expand its relevance and make dissonance an opportunity rather than a challenge for public awareness.

4. Ongoing exchange of knowledge and practices on dissonant heritage

Systematic knowledge and sharing of best practices can strengthen and enlarge groups of common interest. One suggestion is to map compatible sites, actors and institutions in order to create synergies. City partnerships based on dissonant heritage (e.g. Poznan/Strasbourg) or the experiences from student and school pupil exchanges on dissonant heritage issues (e.g. ATRIUM Forli) need to become a more consolidated practice. These efforts can foster the understanding of democratic principles throughout Europe.

5. Network of networks

Dissonant heritage is a cross-cutting topic of European concern. It requires networks across different levels and sectors. Interdisciplinary approaches are a good way to raise awareness in many fields. The common **work on integrated approaches to dissonant heritage has the potential to become a “network of networks”** with a strong multiplier function.

6. Added value of dealing with dissonant heritage

The European comparative perspective on attitudes towards the past can help to structure and raise public awareness and democracy building. This added value proves that it is necessary to give dissonant heritage a special status and attention. The process of raising awareness has the capacity to increase social cohesion depending on how contested the site is. It is desirable to develop new categories of reference such as **“cultural environment”**, which includes the dissonant heritage site together with heritage practices.

3.4.5 Main conclusions regarding the following research questions

Which integrated approaches and strategies are suitable for dealing with the dissonant heritage in order to promote its functions for (urban) society, urban and regional development as well as (cultural) tourism? What participatory approaches for handling dissonant heritage sites and issues are there, particularly in relation to contested sites and competing memories? What tools, methods and procedures are available to the different stakeholders? At what stages can municipalities play a key role?

First of all, it is important to distinguish between the different degrees of recognition of dissonant heritage sites. These can range from high to basic to very low acceptance by society and major political parties. Depending on the degree of recognition, awareness of dissonant heritage sites differs in society and the political sphere; as a result, different approaches need to be applied to increase awareness and support for dissonant heritage sites.

The communication process in the experiences explored shows the significance of the work on layers, values and **perspectives of heritage**. This work involves “**democratising**” and finding windows of opportunity to start an open, participatory process, getting in touch with key partners, building trust, transparency and continuity, and sharing goals. It is a challenging task, especially in smaller places where all kinds of support are needed in parallel. It takes time and a different attitude to listen to each other and to tolerate the multitude of voices. This means not thinking in terms of projects which are limited in time and not anchored in the institution, but instead working within a permanent learning framework adding resources: time, financing and staff.

According to the findings, the re-interpretation and re-contextualisation of the past, its heritage and monuments in a multi-level permanent learning framework are a central requirement for raising public awareness. Dissonant heritage is a matter of collective memory and daily choices where changing generations, various interest groups and perception play a role. The integrated approaches require decisions at a political level on how to invest and educate and how to maintain and interpret the place, but also how to forget and to delete.

Integrated approaches can help the dissonant heritage sites to cooperate with their towns and regions to be better connected, also using digital media and creative means, in order to raise public awareness and gain support and volunteers. They can create a different narrative about the place, in particular when dissonant heritage sites are characterised by multiple layers of history superimposed on each other which may be explored to different degrees. Engaging national and international experts can help to broaden local perspectives on the significance of the site.

What is at stake here is the value of dissonant heritage for collective memory. The assessments and findings show **that open and broad communication about the complex and “forgotten” facets of the history of each place is the most efficient way to provide a forum for a variety of interpretations, broaden the perception of what happened in the local context, and link this to what happened in the national and international context.** Engaging local communities in developing the dissonant heritage site allows citizens to see themselves as part of a wider history.

It has become evident that cities and municipalities play a key role if they are willing to establish a long-term integrated perspective for the issue and the communication. Raising this awareness is one challenge, as is addressing the questions of how connected relevant stakeholders are locally, regionally and internationally in Europe, and what conditions are needed to improve networks even further.

3.5 Financing and management

Smaller cities have limited financial and human resources and expertise. However, dissonant heritage sites and integrated approaches require special commitment, experience and expertise. Financial resources and professional management are needed to protect the cultural heritage, ensure its integrated development and secure long-term financing. The study explored the current funding conditions and how to improve them to support dissonant heritage sites and encourage integrated approaches. The following chapter summarises the main findings from the survey, the case studies, the expert interviews and the expert workshop.



Tallinn City Hall, Soviet Union construction for the Moscow 1980 Summer Olympics, Estonia
Kadi-Liis Koppel, visittallinn.ee

3.5.1 Main findings of the survey

Financing

Funding in general is an important topic for dissonant heritage sites. In the survey, 72 % of the heritage sites said they had a permanent budget, and most of them have a business plan; 38 % also receive ongoing support from volunteers. Most of these heritage sites have a permanent budget and own staff, since working with volunteers requires staff to recruit, supervise and coordinate the volunteers.


Survey respondents stated that the main funding for dissonant heritage sites came from national and regional sources. One-third also generate their own income. Only one-quarter acquire EU funding. The average budget of a dissonant heritage site consists of slightly more than 20 % each of local, national and regional funds.

National funds are mainly used for preservation and maintenance, events, education and exchange and networking activities. Regional funds are mainly used for staff, preservation and maintenance, marketing and communication, education, and exchange and networking activities. Private funds are mainly used for events, outreach and education and marketing and public relations. Local funds are used evenly for all kinds of activities.


It is noticeable that, when national funding sources are used, they account on average for more than 50 % of the total budget. The same applies to regional and local funding sources. When private or own funding sources are used, they account on average for about one-third of the total budget. When EU funding sources are used, they account on average for about 15 % of the total budget. Half of the heritage sites use more than one source of funding.

This indicates that dissonant heritage sites rely on multiple sources of funding for preserving the dissonant heritage site and for implementing integrated approaches. This requires qualified staff, which is not always available. At the same time, dissonant heritage sites depend on public funding sources, as own and private funding sources cannot be tapped in sufficient amounts for their tasks. The required public funding cannot come primarily from the EU budget or from EU funding programmes. Here, the national states and their regional institutions are responsible for providing sufficient funding.

Levels of main funding sources for dissonant heritage sites
Own illustration



Share of funding source of an "average" budget of a dissonant heritage site
Own illustration



Management

In the survey, most dissonant heritage sites (85 %) stated that an institution was responsible for managing the heritage site. Sites with no particular site management are often in private or public ownership at local level. The management is at the local level in about 50 % of the cases. For about 29 % of the sites, different levels and institutions are in charge of the site. In practice, this often means a variety of interests, hampering consensus on the handling and preservation of the dissonant heritage site.

3.5.2 Main findings of the case studies

Financing

In the survey and in greater detail in the case study interviews, most stakeholders explained that the main financing needs are for safety, preservation and restoration. Moreover, (additional) funding sources/programmes are needed for:

- staff, maintenance and operating costs
- comprehensive and science-based development and restoration strategies
- cultural, educational, remembrance and community activities for outreach and to increase awareness of dissonant heritage
- information/knowledge centre/exhibitions on site
- audio/smart guides in different languages
- international networking and cooperation focused on (dissonant) heritage, since such cooperation can provide a new incentive to address the dissonant heritage at local level
- advanced training programmes for staff, especially regarding management, fundraising and integrated approaches
- volunteer programmes
- research
- online platforms to present and discuss dissonant heritage sites, when discussion is not possible at the local level (for example because of the political situation)
- improving accessibility of remote dissonant heritage sites

The following funding sources were mentioned by the interview partners:

- at EU level: ERDF, LEADER, Creative Europe, INTERREG and Erasmus+
- at national/regional level: education and remembrance programmes in particular
- private sources: foundations

The interviews also revealed that accessing funding often is not one of the regular tasks of the responsible institution or that staff are not trained to do so. In addition, the requirements for acquiring and using funding often exceed the personnel/administrative capacities of smaller institutions responsible for dissonant heritage sites. In such cases, the acquisition of funding is limited, or staff do not know where or how to start.

Management

The case study interviews with local stakeholders involved in the management of integrated approaches to dissonant heritage clarified that there is almost no (institutionalised) management of integrated approaches which consciously focuses on linking the dissonant heritage site to the other topics referred to in the interviews. The same applies to development planning for dissonant heritage sites and their use, which is often obligatory to apply for larger funding for restoration.

Instead, such links are made when the institution responsible for the heritage site is also responsible for another of these topics. This is often true of the field of awareness-raising, education and remembrance, which in many cases is a core task of the institution responsible for the dissonant heritage site (when there is official recognition of the dissonant heritage site).

The case study interviews also relativise some links referred to in the survey which might not be well-developed or operate as intended. This seems particularly true of regional, urban, neighbourhood and community development. These links still need to be identified and developed. Especially in the case of less-accessible heritage sites located outside of towns in peripheral areas, a link with urban development is possible only to a very limited extent. In addition, the less political and civic support a dissonant heritage site receives or the more contested it is, the more difficult it appears to link it to community development.

Often the dissonant heritage site is a focus for others: for instance tourism organisers or artists make use of the dissonant heritage site for their own (professional) purposes. In doing so, they do not automatically focus on addressing dissonance, especially with regard to sites where other aspects may be more influential than the dissonance. An example is the Atlantic Wall in Raversyde, Belgium, where the remains of Nazi fortifications from the Second World War line the coast. The contrast between the abandoned concrete bunkers and a beautiful beach has long inspired artists, although the dissonance and history of the place were not directly addressed. Over time, however, artists have become more **aware of the site's past and reflected it more in their art**.



Atlantikwall Raversyde – bunker at the beach, Ostende, Belgium
Raversyde Atlantikwall

The understanding of and objectives for integrated approaches also vary. Some interviewees found it sufficient **for the dissonant heritage simply to be linked “somehow” to other topics, while others sought to achieve concrete goals**. To promote integrated approaches, it is necessary to communicate the mutual benefits that such approaches can provide for stakeholders, for example how tourism can benefit from the dissonant heritage site and how the heritage site can benefit from tourism.

3.5.3 Main findings of the expert interviews

Financing

Permanent institutional funding for the main tasks of dissonant heritage sites from mixed sources (local, regional, national) has to be structurally guaranteed. Most experts considered this to be the precondition for all other kinds of activities. There are some institutional challenges, for example municipal co-financing for funding programmes is sometimes lacking and in some cases there is not enough coordination between the different funding levels regarding which needs are to be funded by whom.

The logic of funding does not correspond to the needs of dissonant heritage sites. When seeking funding, applicants must define the results and outputs of a project. This makes it difficult to implement more open, process-oriented and integrated projects in which outputs are not clear from the outset because they need to be defined during the course of the project as a result of cooperation with other stakeholders.

Project funding for additional and newly integrated activities is needed in order to reach and activate stakeholders and groups to access and become aware of their spaces and their memories. One experience showed how

effective projects with scholars or students can be when dissonant heritage is connected to their daily lives and current events. In a co-creation process, two school classes in Forlì, Italy, and Labin, Croatia, developed and used fictional narratives to communicate the dissonance of the Fascist period, designing a story about two young scholars during the Fascist period as a guided audio tour through places from that period in the centre of Forlì. They were accompanied by a cultural organisation that works with school pupils on dissonant heritage, and they had many debates on the spot. The learning effects from this experience should, for example, be incorporated into European student exchange programmes for more continuity and dissemination.

Smaller places and remote areas are in particular need of bridging and knowledge transfer to link European dissonant heritage sites to the present and the future. Recognising that heritage literacy fosters a sense of identity and centres certain values while marginalising others is a task where combined funding programmes can promote integrated approaches. Such approaches give incentives to coordination and multi-stakeholder, intersectoral, interdisciplinary structures (lead: EU funding).

Management

The expert interviews have shown that traditional disciplinary perspectives on cultural heritage, with skills based on deep understanding, often prevail. These disciplines range from history and art history to architecture, archaeology, etc. Many experts have no specific education in monument protection on dissonant heritage issues. Revitalising the sites and bringing them to life with other means such as theatre, staging, community involvement and social behaviour can help lay the foundations for planning. This requires integrated thinking and interdisciplinary teamwork, and can be the starting point of networking and exchange.

Both the existing scholarly studies and the expert interviews stress that the integrated approach is not yet established in professional practice but that such an approach can potentially support the above-mentioned core objectives of dealing with dissonant heritage, involving civil society, and including school learning and other forms of education. Dynamics, eagerness and pressure arise from communities, activists, grassroots activities and social media. The dynamics have to be taken in consideration, even in management terms.

3.5.4 Main findings of the expert workshop

In the working group “Financing and management” during the expert workshop, the participants discussed a variety of issues, which are summarised in the following main findings.

1. Situation of funding and financing

While funding seems to be reasonably well managed by most of the sites considered in this Action (although they are not exempt from difficulties), financing is a recurrent big deficiency. Therefore, it is necessary to identify/list different sources capable of mobilising financial resources, to train new professionals/advisors in this field, to convince funders of the necessity of simplifying procedures and to become more open to new long-term innovative arrangements in order to better integrate funding needs with integrated management/an integrated vision for the sites and in order to mobilise specific funds for targeted activities (education, research, dissemination).

2. Work on the funding criteria for the dissonant heritage sites is needed

Funding to maintain and develop dissonant heritage sites is a core issue. There is a need to identify criteria (beyond dissonance) which would make it possible to prioritise actions. Integrated approaches can make it **possible to show the sites’ potential, for example in terms of education, adapted reuse and cultural tourism.**

3. Capacity building and advanced training for funding and management structures is required

Fundraising often is not the main task of the responsible institution and there are accumulated needs for capacity building in terms of professional skills regarding volunteer work and the acknowledgement of volunteers. This includes structures capable of both managing the sites and obtaining the necessary funding. The local initiatives in charge of some sites need to be enabled to establish (funding) partnerships with public authorities due to funding conditions which do not allow for funding for these initiatives.

4. Enhancing public awareness on the ground

Integrated development concepts for dissonant heritage sites and their use should be drawn up regularly. This also means preparing sound business cases on the basis of strong and professional management; sound estimation of investment needs and revenue generation; and identification of the available funding sources and financial structure mechanism (public/private/mix). Activities such as networking and communication (workshops, conferences to elaborate ideas for projects) also need to be appreciated and consequently funded. To increase public attention, it can be helpful to identify a champion to support the action.

5. Institutional challenges for funding and management need to be tackled

The administrative workload, complexity and bureaucracy of European funding programmes make it difficult to apply for funding. This is especially the case for smaller sites with less extensive management structures. There is a strong need to simplify procedures and to have more flexibility during implementation. Public funds are limited and are subject to strong competition. Better coordination between the different public funding levels is also needed. The transnational dimension of investment funds needs to be strengthened.

3.5.5 Main conclusions regarding the following research questions

What funding options can be used to deal with the dissonant heritage and its preservation and development? What management structures for dissonant heritage sites can be found? What are the differences and similarities?

Dissonant heritage, memory work and the implementation of integrated approaches require long-term funding for professional structures, full-time staff and a fixed budget (institutionalisation). Institutional structures can best guarantee that dissonant heritage is dealt with and remembered in the long term. The basic prerequisites for such institutionalisation and continuous funding are the support of the local stakeholders and a political and social atmosphere that allows for dealing with the history of the place.

There is strong competition for limited public funds. Dissonant heritage sites can have difficulties connecting their relevant activities to the available funding sources. Typical topics and activities to be financed (e.g. democracy building, education, restoration of the built structures, access and info centres, etc.) are supported by different funding programmes and levels. Discussions at the expert workshop **stressed that the dissonant site's** potential, such as its significance in terms of democracy-promoting discourse or *Baukultur* (e.g. many dissonant heritage sites and many conceptual measures are funded in Germany's Federal programme "National Urban Development Projects"), **may facilitate access to funding.**

Tapping into these programmes and levels requires a greater administrative and staff effort, whereas the existing management structures are often limited. In particular, EU funding programmes often require a greater administrative effort. The interview partners at local level stressed the need for programmes that have a modest administrative workload in relation to the funding made available, flexibility in terms of how money can be spent, and the ability to adapt the outputs to be produced/results to be achieved if doing so is conducive to the success and quality of the project. **Co-funding should also be contributed in kind, that is, through organisations' own personnel**, and organisations with a small budget should be enabled to lower the co-funding rate. In certain cases, staff resources should also be eligible for funding. Integrated funding schemes across different fields and activities, including conceptual frameworks and applied research, would also be very supportive and would promote integrated approaches. For NGOs and civic institutions and initiatives it can be difficult to establish (funding) partnerships with public authorities as there are different working cultures and rules.

For smaller towns, dealing with dissonant heritage sites of national importance on their own can quickly become a financial and professional burden. Smaller towns often have smaller budgets and lack specialised staff capable of dealing with the dissonant heritage. In particular when the dissonance is of national importance, smaller cities may be overwhelmed by leading the discourse just from the local level and developing approaches to deal with the dissonant heritage site. They are dependent on external professional and financial support from the regional and national level in dealing with such sites (burden of dissonance). Especially in small towns and peripheral

areas, limited resources prove to be an obstacle; smaller heritage sites often have to deal with the increasingly old age of their volunteers and with related succession concerns. Research and remembrance work by individuals reaches its limits.

Volunteers can have an important role in dealing with dissonant heritage as they often have a special connection with the heritage, which also gives them special motivation; at the same time, they can quickly be overburdened by the tasks and responsibilities, especially when it comes to implementing integrated approaches. They need guidance; ideally, professional and full-time site management structures should be in place to work with the volunteers.

Management structures differ: there are both public and private institutions responsible for management. Often a local institution is responsible for management, even if the owner is at a different level. Thus, regional or national public institutions that hold responsibility for the dissonant heritage site may use or commission local institutions to manage it. This is usually accompanied by funding for the institution, which is, however, limited to the core tasks. Activities that go beyond such tasks, for example for integrated approaches, often have to be funded from specifically acquired sources.

Dissonant heritage sites where the public sector has not assumed responsibility for managing the site are sometimes managed by local initiatives that turn into associations and foundations over time. In such cases, the available financial resources are often very limited and those running the site have to rely on volunteer work, which in turn leads to increased involvement by citizens, initiatives and other stakeholders.



Rivesaltes Camp Memorial – French internment and transit camp during WW II, Salses-le-Château, France
Kevin Dolmaire, EPCC Mémorial du Camp de Rivesaltes



Concentration camp Natzweiler-Struthof, Natzweiler, France
CSAD-Mutzig

4 Recommendations for better knowledge, better regulation and better funding of integrated approaches to dissonant heritage

An essential goal of all Urban Agenda partnerships is to develop policy recommendations for better knowledge exchange, better regulation and better funding in accordance with the Pact of Amsterdam. These recommendations may be directed at the European, national and local levels.

In the Action “Integrated Approaches to Dissonant Heritage”, the following list of recommendations was developed based on surveys, case studies, expert interviews and the discussion at the expert workshop. The catalogue identifies the needs for action at an operational and strategic level in line with the following main questions raised in the study:

- What recommendations can be derived with regard to the development potential (functions) and preservation of the dissonant heritage?
- What recommendations are to be formulated for (political) decision-makers at the European and national levels?

In the further work within the CCHP, the essence of recommendations from all eleven Actions will be compiled into a political document that is scheduled to be submitted to the European Commission in summer 2022.

4.1 Better knowledge

4.1.1 Strategic level

Strengthen the knowledge base and support for dissonant heritage sites through networking

1. **Setting up a “network of networks”** for better communication and promotion of dissonant heritage and expansion of the pan-European networks dealing with dissonant heritage issues. Developing and **communicating a key message/vision** of recognising the value of discussing conflicts and the role of dissonant heritage for democratic culture (rule of law, participation, human rights). Involving multiple stakeholders from different levels and institutions (vertical and horizontal integration). Identifying a champion to support your action in campaigning in the public realm.
2. **Creating and convening a European learning lab on dissonant heritage** for stakeholders at all relevant levels for discussing, sharing and learning about dissonance and dissonant heritage sites (without local/national bias). Involving political leaders in dissemination activities, also to increase the credibility of dissonant heritage sites and to point out their significance, and to help to influence and initiate local discussions. Looking for a search-and-find space for allies and partners and seeking to develop joint projects: systematic knowledge and sharing of practices can strengthen and enlarge groups of common interest.
3. **Preparing good practice examples** of integrated approaches to dissonant heritage along with questions such as: how can integrated approaches be initiated, what kind of activities can integrated approaches include, how do they work, what can be achieved, who are the cooperation partners? Mapping compatible sites, actors and institutions and making them visible in order to create synergies, taking the local/national context into account with regard to integrated approaches.
4. **Creating transnational (exchange) activities within existing formats** to raise awareness about less well-known dissonant heritage sites, to introduce a European perspective to local discussions and to demonstrate the advantages of preserving dissonant heritage sites and using integrated approaches (e.g. during the European Heritage Days and the European Week of Regions and Cities and in the framework of the New European Bauhaus and the European Urban Initiative). Disseminating good practice

experiences such as city partnerships centred on dissonant heritage issues (e.g. Poznan/Strasbourg) or the international student and scholar exchanges based on dissonant heritage issues, such as ATRIUM Forli and generally the Cultural Routes of the Council of Europe.

5. **Creating (temporary) thematic exchange and learning networks** with a working programme and local action groups (comparable to URBACT networks) for dissonant heritage sites with similar challenges and issues of concern to provide impetus for local actions.
6. **Having a coordinator in charge of a network** who is responsible for organising network exchanges, coordinating partners, supporting administrative work, developing the network, searching for funding, etc. Guaranteeing that this coordinator is paid, for instance by the network members.

4.1.2 Operational level

Strengthen heritage sites dealing with their dissonance both by linking them to other fields/topics and by cooperating with multiple stakeholders

Fields and topics linked to dissonant heritage sites

1. **Communicating and promoting topics and issues that are well suited for integrated approaches and the opportunities they offer**, both for those responsible for the dissonant heritage and for the field/topic the dissonant heritage site can be linked to (e.g. tourism, education, arts and culture, community development). Linking the topics of concern with each other to achieve a coherent, interdisciplinary approach to deal with dissonant heritage.
2. **Strengthening local dissonant heritage sites by dealing with dissonant heritage in a comparative European perspective**. Promoting exchange and external visibility as an added value to provide structure, raise public awareness and support democracy building in the local context, especially in smaller cities and remote areas.
3. **Conducting applied research** as a basis for integrated approaches and activities; learning research-based facts and identifying different facets and perspectives of the dissonant heritage site to develop new insights and topics.
4. **Establishing permanent and professional structures** (staff, coordinators, etc.) to initiate, develop, implement and coordinate integrated approaches. Implementing a strategic long-term perspective.
5. **Organising strong support and financial resources** for the initiation and implementation of integrated approaches. Identifying “change makers” and well-known local key individuals to support the action.

Stakeholder involvement and cooperation

6. **Having a dedicated budget for participatory and cooperation activities** to support stakeholder involvement and the implementation of related activities and projects that come out of the process. Securing time, staff and financial resources at an early stage.
7. **Having a professional, paid coordinator for stakeholder involvement** and cooperation, in particular when working with volunteers. **Engaging volunteers** is crucial and generates enthusiasm, energy and inspiration, even if it requires additional coordination efforts.
8. **Using digital media to gain visibility, support and volunteers**, in particular for remote sites where potential local partners are scarce.
9. **Developing a clear idea of the nature of the dissonant heritage site and its focus**, both to raise public awareness and to attract suitable partners. Using and elaborating the idea as a strong point of reference to convince potential partners and supporters of the importance of cooperation as an added value of the dissonant heritage site.
10. **Scaling up, ensuring continuous cooperation, building up trust** starting with smaller or less contested topics and projects. Based on successful participatory processes and cooperation, building up further involvement and cooperation activities or permanent structures (e.g. committee, steering group) for continuous cooperation. This will strengthen the level of trust between stakeholders and the base of supporters.

11. **Getting in touch with key partners:** getting to know and understand their motivation for dealing with the dissonant heritage site, seeking out common interests and goals.
12. **Engaging national and international experts** to bring in their specific perspectives and help to diversify and broaden local perspectives on the significance of the site.
13. **Basing transparent participatory approaches and cooperation on clear roles and rules and a clear trajectory:** explaining from the start the roles of each involved stakeholder and the rules of involvement, and only allowing those who agree to these rules to participate. Explaining clearly the purpose of the involvement and cooperation and what can and cannot be achieved in order to avoid misunderstandings and false expectations.
14. **Ensuring ownership and support of ideas and results that come out of stakeholder involvement and cooperation** by developing shared ideas and projects dealing with the dissonance and jointly executing them. Ensuring financial resources for the implementation of project ideas and activities.
15. **Motivating stakeholders and communities, involving them in the interpretation of the site and reaching out to groups with different perspectives** to ensure an open, public dialogue about different perspectives and narratives and to integrate them into the interpretation of the dissonant heritage site. Finding ways to motivate local communities and actively reach out to groups with different perspectives so that these communities and groups can reflect on the various perspectives – based on a strong foundation of scholarly knowledge, as well as a strong understanding of the context in order to rule out perspectives that are not fact-based. Making use of oral history, arts projects and participatory approaches to include many groups. Identifying and addressing potential barriers to participation for stakeholders. Extending the debate to the national/European level if necessary to broaden the range of perspectives and make dissonance an opportunity rather than a challenge for public awareness.
16. **Allowing emotions, different perspectives and narratives to be expressed** as a part of dissonant heritage sites. Facilitating such expression, but not seeking to reconcile different perspectives. Often, emotions are attached to the different perspectives. They cannot and should not be “erased”, but if necessary should be “calmed down” to a level that enables a discourse about the different perspectives. Alternatively, developing a new approach to the different perspectives that allows a different type of discourse/focus.

4.2 Better regulation

4.2.1 Strategic level

1. **Developing a regulatory framework for a European learning lab on dissonant heritage** as a cross-cutting topic of European concern which requires multi-level and multi-sectoral networking. Using joint work on integrated approaches as an opportunity to raise awareness and offer support from many disciplines; embedding this work in a trust-based long-term process for political recognition in terms of structural funding. Making this learning lab the place for debating and identifying multi-criteria matrixes (beyond dissonance) in order to prioritise actions and implement tailor-made funding programmes.
2. **Developing and adopting a dissonant heritage protection “regulation”** comparable to the UNESCO Convention on the Protection of Underwater Cultural Heritage.
3. **Developing an ethical charter/guidelines on what to consider when linking dissonant heritage to other topics and sectors**, for example what kinds of tourism, cultural, artistic and commercial (revenue-generating) activities and uses are appropriate for which type of dissonant heritage sites.
4. **Implementing a long-term programme for transnational exchange and support** for organisations and initiatives dealing with dissonant heritage and for students, pupils, teachers and educational institutions for joint (learning) activities related to dissonant heritage and history – this programme should be based on the experience of ‘Erasmus+’ and ‘Europe for Citizens’ and should be developed jointly with DG Education & Culture.
5. **Putting in place regulations that allow regional/national governments to financially support privately owned or privately managed dissonant heritage sites** when the sites are listed or have a letter of intent from a relevant public institution.
6. **Including “dissonant topics”** related to dissonant heritage sites in school curricula.

4.2.2 Operational level

1. **Ensuring that politically independent institutions (with basic funding) are in charge of maintenance and management of dissonant heritage sites and installing decentralised decision-making structures** to decide what is allowed in listed dissonant heritage sites (especially with regard to construction and restoration measures) in order to simplify and speed up decision-making and approval processes.
2. **Including “dissonant heritage” as a category for monument protection** to enable the listing of dissonant heritage sites, even when all physical traces have disappeared.
3. **Adapting monument protection regulations to allow not only the restoration of the original state, but also the preservation of the different time layers** of a building/monument/site to better demonstrate the manifold histories of the site.
4. **Adapting land-use and zoning regulations** to make it possible to define uses that are not allowed at or around a dissonant heritage site because of ethical concerns (e.g. an amusement park next to a concentration camp).
5. Regulating the reinvestment of **revenues from activities at (dissonant) heritage sites at the heritage site**.

4.3 Better funding

4.3.1 Strategic level

1. **Providing longterm institutional funding for organisations in charge of dissonant heritage sites.** Enabling sites to hire staff, to implement longterm and integrated actions and to contract consultancies (professionalisation and institutionalisation) as a key for successful work. Creating the prerequisites for permanent budgets with broad support at the decision-making level, particularly at the regional level, as well as a good and clearly communicable content-related concept and a business plan. Currently, institutional support for dissonant heritage sites is considered to be established if a permanent budget is provided by regional and/or national institutions. Sometimes it is also secured by the local authority if the institution in charge of the dissonant heritage site is part of the local public administration.
2. **Providing funding for additional project activities** dealing with the site and its dissonance. Hiring additional professional staff to improve the conditions for applying for and managing projects (accounting, documentation), in particular those of European programmes. In the long run, overcoming **“patchwork” project funding, in particular if integrated approaches are to be applied, as it does not allow for continuous work on the dissonant heritage sites.**
3. **Providing funding for research programmes that foster “dissonant heritage” issues in order** to collect facts on dissonant heritage sites, support local and integrated activities, and allow for research on wider narratives and perspectives, as well as on the dissonant heritage of the future (e.g. current oil shipping ports).
4. **Requiring EU incentives to integrate dissonant heritage into national and regional policies and funding programmes** and to earmark budgets for projects related to dissonant heritage sites. Supplementing funding programmes to enable the topic of dissonant heritage to more easily fit with funding programmes. Integrated approaches are key here.
5. **Encouraging integrated approaches to dissonant heritage sites and their adaptive reuse within funding programmes,** for example (innovative) cultural, tourist, educational and outreach activities as well as community development projects about and with dissonant heritage sites. Providing funding programmes which allow for a variety of approaches to inspire creativity and innovation for integrated approaches. In this spirit, connecting funding provided for the adaptive reuse of certain types of dissonant heritage sites to social and public uses at the site.
6. **Providing funding for (local) networks and communication to integrate different local stakeholders** and to ensure integrated approaches and enlarged perspectives and knowledge.

7. Connecting dissonant heritage issues to the **transnational dimension of cohesion policy and funding** within the European Urban Initiative 2021-2027, which aims to **support cities through innovative actions, capacity and knowledge building, policy development and communication about sustainable urban development.**

4.3.2 Operational level

1. **Understanding the nature of the dissonant heritage site**, especially the specific kind of dissonance, as a precondition for seeking financial support. Providing support for funding recipients for their **operational work and for the maintenance of the site. Preparing sound business cases on the sites'** opportunities and potential, for example in terms of adapted reuse and cultural tourism. Such cases should highlight strong/professional management, sound estimation of investment needs and revenue generation and identification of the available financial resources and financial structure mechanism (public, private or mixed).
2. **Generating site-specific revenues** (for which staff is needed, too): Encouraging the development of independent sources of income, for example from membership and entrance fees; commercial activities such as bookshops, events, festivals (which are possible at certain types of dissonant heritage sites) and renting out space; as well as donations/fundraising and prize money from competitions (even fines from court cases can be mentioned here); volunteer support can also be an important in-kind contribution. **Keeping in mind that the site's dissonance places limits on the generation of site-specific revenues**, especially when it comes to places where atrocities have happened (e.g. merchandising products cannot be sold or festivals organised).
3. **Providing funding for structural preservation and safeguarding of the dissonant heritage** as a key to authentically conveying the history/histories and circumstances that a site represents. Setting up such funding as an urgent priority. In terms of protection, acting to prevent further damage to the site: the physical preservation of the heritage site is the condition for the implementation of integrated approaches.
4. **Adapting funding programmes to target smaller organisations that manage dissonant heritage sites.** In many cases, smaller organisations cannot manage major funding programmes, as they have a smaller and less professional staff. Establishing simplified procedures and more flexibility during implementation. Supporting the administration of funds through co-funding rates with less demanding requirements. In addition, granting financial support to smaller projects that can be used in a flexible way.
5. **Improving regional or national offices to support the acquisition and administration of funding** by providing information on suitable funding programmes and institutions; offering training courses on acquiring and applying for funding and generating revenues; and offering support in the administration of (EU) funding.
6. **Offering capacity building to boost professional skills** with respect to volunteer work and to management structures capable of handling the site and obtaining the necessary funding.



La Model – prison of political dissidents during Franco dictatorship - site visit of Action Group 10, Barcelona, Spain
Jan Schultheiß

5 Outlook

The work of the Partnership on Culture and Cultural Heritage and the 11 Action Groups will be formally concluded with a booklet of policy recommendations delivered to the European Commission in summer 2022.

The following focused outputs and events for discussing and disseminating the results and strategic recommendations on integrated approaches to dissonant heritage in Europe are planned:

- an online networking event in February 2022
- the publication of a toolbox for local practitioners by summer 2022
- prospects at European level for continuing and strengthening the dialogue of the Dissonant Heritage Action Group, e.g. in the framework of the New European Bauhaus or the European Heritage Days

Many issues have been raised in the study. There is a further need to explore the significance and potential of dissonant heritage sites in terms of strengthening cities and regions, (cultural) tourism, and democracy and identity building in Europe. A continuous and multi-vocal debate on dissonant heritage, which raises public awareness of its significance and function, is more relevant than ever and is crucial for democratic cohesion. Along with articulating the key message, a comparative mapping of ways of dealing with dissonant heritage, management forms and modes of remembrance in Europe can help to further explore differences and similarities in the recognition and management of such sites and to identify good practices.

A broad range of positions and practical experiences on the ground can also help to develop guidelines and ways to deal with specific obstacles and needs in order to achieve strong European support of dissonant heritage sites through targeted research, better regulation and better funding opportunities. This is especially the case for smaller cities and remote areas, as described in the outcomes of this study.

Pan-European cooperation shows how important sharing of dissonant heritage experiences is. Some groups and networks are working on common categories of dissonant sites, while others are working in specific academic disciplines and fields. Some transnational institutions are concerned with lobbying and policy recommendations. The Action Group has started to connect these network activities, and in doing so has generated promising initial synergies. The question of suitable integrated approaches and strategies for dealing with dissonant heritage to promote its role in (urban) society, urban and regional development and (cultural) tourism, as well as to initiate **sustainable use, is to be further explored. “Better knowledge” of the added value of integrated approaches** requires the multiplier effects of systematic and cross-cutting dissemination activities which serve as a “network of networks”.

5.1 Online Forum “Integrated Approaches to Europe’s Dissonant Heritage”

The Online Forum “Integrated Approaches to Europe’s Dissonant Heritage: Insights, Networks, and Future Perspectives” is scheduled for 16 - 17 February 2022. At this networking event, the Action Group of European experts will present and reflect on its results together with a broader European public. In addition, funding programmes for dissonant heritage will be highlighted along with opportunities for European networks to connect and expand.

The event will include the following elements:

- Discussion of the results and recommendations of CCHP Action 10
- Presentation of good practices in dissonant heritage
- Knowledge transfer about funding opportunities
- Information about European/international activities
- Future perspectives and next steps

An online marketplace for networking and sharing among initiatives and projects involved with Europe's dissonant heritage is intended to intensify pan-European cooperation and multi-level perspectives.

5.2 Toolbox “Integrated Approaches to Dissonant Heritage”

The results of the study underline the need for knowledge transfer and tools to deal with and start addressing dissonant heritage. This includes information on how to gain support, whom to involve and cooperate with at the **local and regional level, and how to “remember” what has happened in dissonant heritage sites, creating new readings and interpretations of the past.**

Integrated approaches to dissonant heritage are a new field of activity (Potz, Scheffler 2022a, 2022b). The potential of urban and regional development in this area especially needs to be explored, explained and communicated in a practice-oriented outcome. A toolbox, to be developed by summer 2022, will mainly target local practitioners and relevant stakeholders involved in the management of dissonant heritage sites and related integrated approaches in smaller towns and remote regions.

The survey, the case study interviews and the expert interviews have revealed that local starting points, framework conditions and types of dissonant heritage sites vary greatly. Interviewees stated their interest in advice, guidance, principles and concrete examples of good practices. How can perceptions of dissonant heritage as an issue of public interest be changed in many places in Europe and the understanding of it broadened? In order to provide valuable tools for a broad audience, the toolbox needs to be sufficiently general and transferable.

5.3 What are the next steps after the Urban Agenda for the EU?

For the upcoming funding period of 2021-2027, the continuation of thematic partnerships within the framework of the EU Urban Agenda was confirmed by the Ljubljana Agreement of November 2021 (Slovenian Presidency 2021). This agreement clearly emphasised the implementation of the five principles of the European reference document of the EU Member States on sustainable urban development, the [New Leipzig Charter](#) – urban policy for the common good, an integrated approach, participation and co-production, multi-level governance and a place-based approach (Informal Ministerial Meeting 2020).

For dealing with dissonant heritage as a cross-cutting issue in Europe, the integrated approach of the Urban Agenda has proven to be an important innovation as it leads to interdisciplinary and multi-level discussions as well as to new cooperation and increased attention across Europe. At a political event in Brussels planned for the summer of 2022, the Partnership on Culture and Cultural Heritage (CCHP) **will submit the Actions' findings and recommendations to the European Commission to be incorporated into EU policy.** European attention can create new opportunities for exchange, cooperation and access to funding. A wide range of stakeholders and decision-makers can be reached and mobilised for the integrated development of dissonant heritage sites.

The [New European Bauhaus](#) (NEB) initiative of the EU, which launched in 2020, aims to connect the European Green Deal to living spaces and is based on principles that combine global and local issues, participatory **approaches and interdisciplinarity with the motto “beautiful – sustainable – together”.** It provides an opportunity for the continuation of the CCHP discussion, including and emphasising the complex topic of integrated approaches to dissonant heritage. The NEB completed its first participatory co-design phase in September 2021 and is currently carrying out a large co-creation process accompanied by the implementation of pilot projects **and dissemination activities such as a “Think-and-Do-Tank”.** **The Action's work on dissonant heritage is in line with and strongly supports the idea of a community-led agenda.** One of its main purposes is to support the building of identity and fostering of democratic values (CCHP 2021).

The [Faro Convention](#) on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society (Council of Europe 2005) has great potential for dissonant sites. It can mainly be adopted for those types of dissonant heritage which are not directly affected by atrocities. Implementing the Faro Convention can help to introduce an instrument of civic participation in the relationship between a city and its heritage, a methodology for including residents, and a philosophy and deeper understanding of why and how to encourage citizens to participate. This participation is to occur in an

atmosphere that allows for discussion of substantive content and not only ideological debate, especially where dissonant heritage is concerned.

Continued European “network of networks” on dissonance in heritage

The Action Group noted the importance of a broad ongoing dialogue and a better structural anchoring of the dissonant heritage sites, especially given the framework conditions under which smaller cities and peripheral locations operate. Dissonant heritage as a common European theme for democracy promotion requires strong public awareness and political recognition. The European Heritage Days or the European Week of Cities and Regions could serve as strategic moments for continuing the European discussion.

The discourse on values and attitudes is essential in this context in order to generate ongoing public interest in the preservation and integration of dissonant heritage. This is not a matter of reconstructing a certain historical aesthetic, but rather of dealing responsibly with history and complexity and at the same time using the potential of heritage for urban development. Core values for further discussions include enduring rather than suppressing dissonance, using conflicts productively and addressing tensions.

How can the integrated approach help to bridge and transfer knowledge and to link dissonant heritage sites to the present and the future? The partners of Action 10 want to open the floor to allow for a multi-vocal history and culture of remembrance and also to reflect on the current building stock and infrastructure as the potential dissonant heritage of tomorrow. Anybody who would like to join this European dialogue is very welcome!



Historical Olympic Village of 1936 (Berlin) - aerial view of (re)construction in the first development stage, Wustermark, Germany
terraplan Baudenkmalanierungsgesellschaft mbH



Statue General Emile Storms – vandalized colonial symbol in the public space, Ixelles, Belgium
P. Ingelaere, 2020 - urban.brussels

6 References

- Bull**, Anna Cento (2021): Approaches to Memory in Dealing with Difficult/Dissonant Heritage. Report for the Action 10 of the Partnership on Culture and Cultural Heritage, Urban Agenda of the EU, unpublished
- Council of Europe** (2005): Faro Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society. <https://www.coe.int/en/web/culture-and-heritage/faro-convention>
- Eckersley**, Susannah (2020): Between appropriation and appropriateness: Instrumentalizing dark heritage in populism and memory? In: De Cesari, Chiara/ Kaya, Ayhan (eds.): European Memory in Populism: Representations of Self and Other. London: Routledge, 210-238
- Informal Ministerial Meeting on Urban Matters** (2020): The New Leipzig Charter: The transformative power of cities for the common good. Adopted on 30 November 2020. https://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/docgener/brochure/new_leipzig_charter/new_leipzig_charter_en.pdf
- Kisić**, Višnja (2016): **Governing Heritage Dissonance: Promises and Realities of Selected Cultural Policies**. Amsterdam: European Cultural Foundation (ECF). https://www.europanostra.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/Governing_Heritage_Dissonance.pdf
- Macdonald**, Sharon (2009): *Difficult Heritage: Negotiating the Nazi Past in Nuremberg and Beyond*. London: Routledge
- Potz**, Petra; **Scheffler**, Nils (2022a): Integrierte Ansätze für das unbequeme Erbe. Ein vielstimmiger Beitrag zum demokratischen Zusammenhalt in Europa. In: *PlanerIn*, no. 1/2022, SRL - Association of Town, Regional and State Planning, Berlin
- Potz**, Petra, **Scheffler**, Nils (2022b): Integrated Approaches for the 20th Century Dissonant Heritage in Europe. In: *In situ*, Revue des Patrimoines, Paris, forthcoming
- TRACES** - Transmitting Contentious Cultural Heritage with the Arts. Horizon 2020 project (2016-2019). <http://www.traces.polimi.it/index.html>
- Tunbridge**, John E./**Ashworth**, Gregory J. (1996): *Dissonant Heritage: The Management of the Past as a Resource in Conflict*. Chichester: Wiley
- Urban Agenda for the EU Partnership on Culture and Cultural Heritage** (2021): Culture and Cultural Heritage for the New European Bauhaus. Paper, 30 June 2021. https://futurium.ec.europa.eu/sites/default/files/2021-07/210630_NEB_CCH_contribution_FIN_corr.pdf
- Urban Agenda for the EU Partnership on Culture and Cultural Heritage** (2020): Final Action Plan. November 2020. <https://futurium.ec.europa.eu/en/urban-agenda/culturecultural-heritage/action-plan/final-action-plan-partnership-culturecultural-heritage>
- Wierdsma**, Tsjalling (2022): Heritage Dissonance and Adaptive Re-use: Report for the Action 10 of the Partnership on Culture and Cultural Heritage, Urban Agenda of the EU, unpublished
- Homepage of the Action Group "Integrated Approaches to Dissonant Heritage": www.dissonant-heritage.eu/

7 Annex

7.1 Members of Action Group 10

with confirmation to have name published by 10.02.2022

Experts

- **Prof. Dr. Riin Alatalu**, Vice president of ICOMOS
- **Mario Aymerich**, European Investment Bank Institute
- **Dr. Gruia Bădescu**, Department of History and Sociology, University of Konstanz
- **Jadé Botha**, EuroClio Inspiring History and Citizenship Educators
- **Adrianna Brechelke**, Institute of Architecture and Spatial Planning, Poznań University of Technology
- **Ed Carroll**, Faro Convention Network
- **Ricard Conesa Sánchez**, University of Barcelona, European Observatory on Memories EUROM
- **Almudena Cruz**, Spain's Ministry for the Presidency, Parliamentary Relations and Democratic Memory
- **Rafaël Deroo**, European Federation of Fortified Sites EFFORTS Europe
- **Dr.-Ing. Claus-Peter Echter**, President ICOMOS CIVVIH, Council Member Europa Nostra
- **Prof. Dr. hab. Hanna Grzeszczuk-Brendel**, Faculty of Architecture, Poznań University of Technology
- **Prof. Dr. Jörg Haspel**, ICOMOS Germany
- **Prof. Dr.-Ing. Carola Hein**, Chair History of Architecture and Urban Planning, Delft University of Technology
- **Dora Ivanova**, Buzludzha Project Foundation
- **Dr. Waltraud Kofler Engl**, Platform Cultural Heritage Cultural Production, Faculty of Design and Art, Free University of Bozen-Bolzano
- **Prof. Dr. Alexandre Kostka**, Faculty of Languages and Applied Human Sciences, University of Strasbourg
- **Prof. Dr. Tuuli Lähdesmäki**, Department of Music, Art and Culture Studies, University of Jyväskylä
- **Prof. Dr. John Patrick Leech**, Department of Interpreting and Translation, University of Bologna
- **Prof. Dr. Carolina Rodríguez-López**, Department of Modern and Contemporary History, Complutense University of Madrid
- **Georgi Stoev**, City of Kazanlak
- **Tsjalling Wierdsma**, City of Amsterdam, Dutch Federation of Cultural Heritage Cities

Coordination

- **Birgit Kann**, German Federal Institute for Research on Building, Urban Affairs and Spatial Development, Project Lead associated research project
- **Jan Schultheiß**, Germany's Federal Ministry of Housing, Urban Development and Building, Action Lead

And many other contributors

7.2 Criteria of Action Group 10 for the selection of dissonant heritage sites for the survey

Main justification

1. Global interest
 - The project is significant in character and has an exemplary role. It can contribute to sustaining local and international knowledge and to cultural and educational action, and it is compatible with the Dissonant Heritage focus.
 - The site is embedded in contested interpretations of the past
2. Significant heritage/architectural value
 - Main reasons for its conservation (tangible/intangible values)
 - Is it of outstanding European value/significance?
 - Historical, heritage, aesthetic, architectural manifesto values
 - Place of memory
 - Multiple meanings attributed to a site by different communities or groups

Characteristics of the site

3. Urban dimension/Urban space of reference and area of significance
 - Urban (scale) heritage site/area
 - Urban dominant site/monument (landmark)
 - Point of identification for urban society or for a local/regional community
 - Point of reference for social commitment
 - Focal point of social debates
4. Location
 - The site is located in an EU Convergence region, other EU, non-EU
 - Location in an environmentally protected area (Natura 2000 area or similar)
 - Location in a small or medium-sized town or village (non-metropolitan city/not a megacity)
 - Geographical remoteness/peripheral location (not a capital area/agglomeration)
5. The site is a listed monument
 - UNESCO
 - National/regional list
 - Docomomo
6. Already linked or linkable with EU programmes
 - European Cultural Routes (ECR)
 - European Heritage Label (EHL)
 - European Heritage Days (EHD)
 - ATRIUM (Architecture of Totalitarian Regimes in Europe's Urban Memory)
 - European heritage conventions/ICOMOS charters

7. Ownership and organisational structure
 - Site inhabited/uninhabited
 - Owner of site (public, private, mixed)
 - Owner supports its conservation/rehabilitation (y/n)
 - Capacity for and openness to working on action (including English language skills)
 - Existing network of stakeholders with interest in European dimension

Threats and opportunities

8. Imminent/tangible threats, due to
 - Abandonment, neglect
 - Deterioration due to lack of maintenance
 - Vandalism
 - Vulnerability through climate change or natural hazards (floods, earthquakes, severe drought, wildfires, rising sea levels, volcanos, tsunamis, and industrial threats such as leakage, explosions and gas emissions)
9. Feasible solution for its conservation
 - Clear definition of a project
 - Identification of potential future uses
 - Support of elected officials and the public for a possible project
 - Consultation of stakeholders
10. Potential for education activities
 - Feasibility of developing a comprehensive plan for education in history, tolerance, diversity, etc.
 - Impact on population in terms of communication and education
 - European dimensions of educational programmes
 - Valuation policy, promotion of dialogue, communication
11. Increased economic/tourism potential
 - Current visitors (figures, fees)
 - Existence of a market study (on potential visitors)
 - Existence of a marketing campaign
12. A priori financial viability
 - Existence of a business plan
 - Potential sources of funds
 - Grants: EU, national/departmental/regional/municipal
 - Donations from private/public foundations, patronage
 - Loans from international financial institutions, promotional banks
 - Other financial instruments (equity, crowdfunding, other)

External support

13. Stakeholders & civil society involvement
 - Presence of an active heritage community (communities)/civil society that has a common interest in a specific heritage site
 - Engaged and supportive political players in the public sector (local/regional/national institutes and authorities)
 - Engaged and supportive stakeholders in the private sector (small-and-medium-sized enterprises, academia, educators, tour operators, etc.)

- Involvement of the local population in the process
- Willingness of the different actors & stakeholders to cooperate
- Consensus on a common vision of and approach to dissonant heritage (possible use of a non-binding memorandum of understanding)
- Presence of people to communicate the project to local populations

14. Other significant aspects

- Relevance to Urban Agenda for the EU framework and process
- Feasibility of implementing action (or at least building its main foundation) within 12 months

International dimension

Certain sites, in particular medium-sized or small ones, tend to share some relevant characteristics (e.g. architectural style, period and reasons for construction) with similar sites in other countries. In such cases, it is relevant to carry out an analysis with a wider perspective. Such an analysis would consider the synergies that grouping the sites and establishing an active collaboration between the different organisations in charge might generate, which would represent an additional value/advantage for the sites.

7.3 List of received surveys

Austria

- 21 Adolf Hitler's birthplace, Braunau
- 22 Concentration Camp Memorial Ebensee

Belgium

- 23 Atlantikwall Raversyde, Oostende, German defensive line of WW I and II
- 24 Colonial symbols in public spaces, Brussels capital region
- 25 Statue of King Leopold II of Belgium at the historic city hall, Leuven, symbol of Belgium colonialism

Bulgaria

- 26 Monument House of the Bulgarian Communist Party - Buzludzha, Kazanlak
- 27 Neoclassical type architecture, Dimitrovgrad, socialist foundation of an industrial city

Croatia

- 28 Jasenovac Concentration Camp Memorial Site
- 29 Ustasha Concentration Camp Slana, Island of Pag

Cyprus

- 30 The Green Line, United Nations Buffer Zone in Cyprus

Estonia

- 31 Tallinn City Hall, Soviet Union construction for the Moscow 1980 Summer Olympics

France

- 32 Concentration Camp Natzweiler-Struthof and its secondary camps in Germany
- 33 Martyr village, Oradour-sur-Glâne, massacre of inhabitants by the SS
- 34 Museums of the History of the Great War, Peronne/Thiepval
- 35 Rivesaltes Camp Memorial, French internment and transit camp during WW II
- 36 Shoah Memorial, Paris/Drancy

Germany

- 37 Borderland Museum, Eichsfeld, former inner-German border and Iron Curtain greenbelt
- 38 Buchenwald Memorial and Mittelbau-Dora Concentration Camp Memorial
- 39 Central Animal Laboratories of the Freie Universität Berlin ("Mice bunker")
- 40 Great goat mountain, Ballenstedt, cadre school of the two German dictatorships of the 20th century
- 41 Historical Olympic Village of 1936, Wustermark
- 42 Memorial site of former labour camp Neuaußing, Munich
- 43 Peenemünde Test Centre, army research centre and the Luftwaffe test site
- 44 Planned city Eisenhüttenstadt, socialist foundation of an industrial city
- 45 **Remembrance, education and meeting centre, Alt Rehse, former Nazi "Leadership School of German Medicine"**
- 46 Saaleck Workshops, designed by anti-Semite and racial ideologist Paul-Schultze Naumburg, used by the Nazi elite as a think tank
- 47 Stasi Headquarters. Campus for Democracy, Berlin
- 48 Vogelsang IP (Internationaler Platz), Schleiden, training centre for the offspring of the NSDAP leadership cadre

Hungary

- 49 Dunaújváros downtown and Technikum district, socialist architecture and urbanism

Italy

50 Historic centre built during the Fascist dictatorship, Forlì

51 Permanent exhibition within the Monument of Victory, Bolzano, erected on the personal orders of Benito Mussolini

Lithuania

52 9th Fort in Kaunas, Russian fortification

North Macedonia

53 Central Post Office Skopje, modernist Brutalist architecture

Northern Ireland

54 Maze Long Kesh, Lisburn, prison in Northern Ireland used to house alleged paramilitary prisoners from 1971 to 2000

Poland

55 Nowa Huta, Kraków, socialist foundation of an industrial city

56 Imperial District, Poznań

Romania

57 Memorial to the Victims of Communism and the Resistance, Sighet

58 **Soviet Socialist architecture and urbanism, Ștei**

Spain

59 La Model, Barcelona, prison of political dissidents during Franco dictatorship

Ukraine

60 Sites and objects, Chernobyl Zone

7.4 Survey

Part A – General information about ‘dissonant heritage site’	
1. <u>Name of heritage site / Title of dissonant heritage</u> <input type="text"/>	
2. <u>Location</u> Town: <input type="text"/> Country: <input type="text"/> Urban area: <input type="checkbox"/> Rural area: <input type="checkbox"/> Please mark the exact location(s) of the “dissonant heritage” on this Google map. You can place markers as well as draw areas.	
3. <u>Website(s)</u> : <input type="text"/>	
4. <u>Owner</u> : Level: <input type="checkbox"/> National <input type="checkbox"/> Regional <input type="checkbox"/> Local <input type="checkbox"/> Private Name of institution: <input type="text"/> Email: <input type="text"/> Telephone: <input type="text"/> Has ownership changed in the last 5 years? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
5. <u>Responsible for the management/handling</u> : Is there an institution responsible for the management / dealing with the cultural heritage site? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If “Yes”: Level: <input type="checkbox"/> National <input type="checkbox"/> Regional <input type="checkbox"/> Local <input type="checkbox"/> Private Name of institution: <input type="text"/> Email: <input type="text"/> Telephone: <input type="text"/> Has management changed in the last 5 years? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If “No”: Is there an interest in dealing with the cultural heritage site in the future? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
6. <u>What is your relation to the heritage site?</u> <input type="checkbox"/> Management <input type="checkbox"/> Owner <input type="checkbox"/> Municipality <input type="checkbox"/> Other	
7. <u>Further information</u> If you would like to explain something or add information, please write here: <input type="text"/>	
We would be grateful if you could upload up to five images that illustrate your site to this dropbox folder. If you do so, please complete and sign the image licensing agreement .	

Part B – Characteristics of the ‘dissonant heritage site’	
<p>1. <u>Heritage site is related to</u> <i>(multiple answers possible)</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Regime/dictatorship/colonialism <input type="checkbox"/> Wars</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Mass killing <input type="checkbox"/> Persecution/resistance</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Worship/religious sites <input type="checkbox"/> Detention/concentration/deportation camps</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Industry <input type="checkbox"/> Memory</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other: <input type="text"/></p>	
<p>2. <u>Time period heritage site is related to</u> <i>(multiple answers possible)</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Colonialism <input type="checkbox"/> Communism/Socialism</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Fascism/Nazism <input type="checkbox"/> Second World War</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> First World War <input type="checkbox"/> Other: <input type="text"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> War after Second World War</p>	
<p>3. <u>Heritage is listed for preservation?</u> <i>(multiple answers possible)</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, at level: <input type="checkbox"/> International <input type="checkbox"/> National <input type="checkbox"/> Regional/local</p> <p>Since what year: <input type="text"/></p>	
<p>4. <u>Heritage is threatened? by</u> <i>(multiple answers possible)</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, by <input type="checkbox"/> Abandonment <input type="checkbox"/> Vandalism <input type="checkbox"/> Natural hazards</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Conflict of interest <input type="checkbox"/> Lack of financial means</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other: <input type="text"/></p>	
<p>5. <u>Heritage site is</u> <i>(multiple answers possible)</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> in use <input type="checkbox"/> not in use <input type="checkbox"/> use is planned <input type="checkbox"/> use is about to change</p> <p>Name current/planned use (if applicable): <input type="text"/></p>	
<p>6. <u>Dissonance of the heritage</u></p> <p>In your opinion, is the heritage site perceived as “contested”/”dissonant” at the local, regional or national level? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>If “No”: What is the reason for it being perceived as not “contested”? <input type="text"/></p> <p>If “Yes”: Why is the heritage site “contested”? <i>(multiple answers possible)</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Unpleasant memory <input type="checkbox"/> Controversial memory <input type="checkbox"/> Controversial use</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other: <input type="text"/></p> <p>What is the controversy/dissonance about?</p> <p><input type="text"/></p> <p>Since when has the controversy/dissonance been discussed (year): <input type="text"/></p>	
<p>7. <u>Further information</u></p> <p>If you would like to explain something or add further information, please write here:</p> <p><input type="text"/></p>	

Part C – Funding of the ‘dissonant heritage site’							
1. Staff							
Does the heritage site have permanent staff?						<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Does the heritage site have continuous support of volunteers?						<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
2. Does the heritage site have a permanent budget? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No							
Funding sources come from							
Level: <input type="checkbox"/> % EU <input type="checkbox"/> % national <input type="checkbox"/> % regional <input type="checkbox"/> % local <input type="checkbox"/> % private <input type="checkbox"/> % own income							
3. What are the funding sources for.../where do they come from?							
	EU	national	regional	local	private	volunteer work	none
Staff	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Preservation/maintenance	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Marketing/communication/PR	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Events	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Outreach/education	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Exchange/networking	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other: <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Is there a business plan for the heritage? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No							
Potential elements of a business plan: a complete technical rehabilitation/restoration project, an environmental/social impact analysis, an implementation plan, a stakeholders’ consultation process, an economic and financial viability study, a marketing plan or a fundraising strategy							
5. What are the main challenges to receiving funding?							
<input type="checkbox"/>							
6. Do you have any proposals concerning permanent and project funding?							
<input type="checkbox"/>							
7. Further information							
If you would like to explain something or add further information, please write here:							
<input type="checkbox"/>							

1. Level of involvement (*multiple answers possible*)

	Information	Consultation/dialogue	Co-design	Co-decision making/co-management
People affected by the dissonant heritage	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Citizens/local initiative	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
NGO/foundation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Academic organisation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Company	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Owner	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Local government	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Regional government	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
National government	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other: <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

2. What are the main challenges of stakeholder involvement?

3. What are the main opportunities of stakeholder involvement?

4. Are communication and outreach channels being used? (*multiple answers possible*)
 No Yes

<input type="checkbox"/> Personal contacts	<input type="checkbox"/> Printed material
<input type="checkbox"/> Newspapers	<input type="checkbox"/> Radio/TV
<input type="checkbox"/> Website/blogs/Wikipedia	<input type="checkbox"/> Social media/social networks
<input type="checkbox"/> Video-photo platforms/podcasts	<input type="checkbox"/> Online games/apps
<input type="checkbox"/> Other: <input type="checkbox"/>	

5. Further information
 If you would like to explain something or add further information, please write here:

<p>Part E – Integrated approaches and networking Within this survey, the term ‘integrated approach’ refers to approaches that link, balance or coordinate the dissonant heritage with other areas and fields of action for mutual benefit.</p>	
<p>1. <u>Is the heritage linked with other areas in practice?</u> <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Urban/neighbourhood development <input type="checkbox"/> Tourism/local businesses <input type="checkbox"/> Culture and creative sector <input type="checkbox"/> Education <input type="checkbox"/> Community development <input type="checkbox"/> Other: <input type="text"/></p>	
<p>2. <u>Do you see opportunities to link the heritage with other areas?</u> <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Urban/neighbourhood development <input type="checkbox"/> Tourism/local businesses <input type="checkbox"/> Culture and creative sector <input type="checkbox"/> Education <input type="checkbox"/> Community development <input type="checkbox"/> Other: <input type="text"/></p> <p>Please describe briefly the opportunities: <input type="text"/></p>	
<p>3. <u>What are the main challenges to integrate the heritage with the other areas?</u> <input type="text"/></p>	
<p>4. <u>Is the heritage included in strategic or development plans/programmes?</u> <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes, at level: <input type="checkbox"/> European/cross-border <input type="checkbox"/> National <input type="checkbox"/> Regional <input type="checkbox"/> Local</p>	
<p>5. <u>Does the heritage play a role in the regional economy/tourism sector?</u> <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>If “Yes”: Please explain: <input type="text"/></p>	
<p>6. <u>Is there engagement in activities related to education or tolerance?</u> <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>If “Yes”: Please explain: <input type="text"/></p>	
<p>7. <u>Is there an exchange/a network/cooperation with other heritage sites/initiatives?</u> <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, at level: <input type="checkbox"/> European <input type="checkbox"/> National <input type="checkbox"/> Regional <input type="checkbox"/> Local</p> <p>Name heritage sites/initiatives: <input type="text"/></p>	
<p>8. <u>On which topics would you like to exchange / network / cooperate with other heritage initiatives/sites?</u></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Management and (re)use of dissonant heritage <input type="checkbox"/> Funding <input type="checkbox"/> Dealing with threats and dissonance <input type="checkbox"/> Stakeholder involvement <input type="checkbox"/> Awareness-raising / marketing <input type="checkbox"/> Linking dissonant heritage with other areas/topics (tourism, culture and creative industry, education, urban development) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: <input type="text"/></p>	
<p>9. <u>Further information</u> If you would like to explain something or add further information, please write here: <input type="text"/></p>	

7.5 List of case studies and interviewees

The list contains those interview partners who explicitly agreed to have their names quoted; the list does not contain all those who participated.

Atlantikwall Raversyde, Oostende, Belgium

- Mathieu de Meyer, Director Atlantikwall Raversyde
- Merel Vercootere, Art Centre
- Hendryk von Busse, Wall & Space/Atlantikwall

Decolonising public space, Leuven, Belgium

Monument House of the Bulgarian Communist Party – Buzludzha, Kazanlak, Bulgaria

- Georgi Stoev, Chief Architect of Kazanlak Municipality
- Momchil Marinov, Director of the Historical Museum “Iskra”

Neoclassical type architecture, Dimitrovgrad, Bulgaria

Ustasha Concentration Camp Slana, Island of Pag, Croatia

- Aneta Vladimirov, Head of Section for Culture of the Serbian National Council in Croatia
- Sanja Horvatinčić, Institute of Art History, Zagreb

Martyr village, Oradour-sur-Glane, France

- Stéphanie Boutaud, Pedagogical Service, Oradour Memory Centre

Concentration Camp Natzweiler-Struthof, France, and its secondary camps in Germany

- Anja König, Coordinator for the Association of Memorials in the Former Concentration Camp Complex Natzweiler e.V. (VGKN)
- Dorothee Roos, Honorary Director of the Neckarelz Concentration Camp Memorial and founding member of the VGKN
- Tobias Markowitsch, Second Chairperson of the VGKN, teacher, Bismarck-Gymnasium Karlsruhe, head of the humanities and social sciences department of the Schülerakademie Karlsruhe e.V.
- Guillaume d’Andlau, Director Centre Européen du Résistant Déporté-Struthof

Borderland Museum, Eichsfeld, Germany (former inner-German border and Iron Curtain greenbelt)

- Mira Keune, Managing Director and Head of the Supporting Association of the Borderland Museum
- Michael Cramer, Initiator/developer of the Iron Curtain Trail cycle path; Green Party ex MEP

Historic centre built during the Fascist dictatorship, Forlì, Italy

- Patrick Leech, President of ATRIUM Route
- Claudia Castellucci, Director of ATRIUM Route, until 2020 employed in the Forlì City Council
- Elena Salvucci, Casa del Cucolo - co-creative association
- Cristina Lentini, DEINA association, educational courses on history and memory for young people
- Nicola Di Camillo, Classical High School Morgagni
- Martina Grandi, Classical High School Morgagni, pupil

Imperial District, Poznań, Poland

- Łukasz Mikuła, Chairman of Spatial Planning and Urban Regeneration Committee of Poznań City Council and Metropolitan Planning Commission for the Poznań Metropolis
- Wojciech Mania, Manager of Tourism Promotion Department Poznań
- Anna Hryniewiecka, Director Culture Centre Zamek - CK Zamek
- Bartosz Wiśniewski, Event organiser Culture Centre Zamek - CK Zamek
- Małgorzata Praczyk, Professor, Faculty of History, Adam Mickiewicz University Poznań

Valley of the Fallen, El Escorial, Spain

- Francisco Ferrándiz, Advisor of the State Secretary for Democratic Memory to develop recommendations for the Valley of the Fallen

7.6 Interview guide for case studies

Interview guide with regard to the topic(s) linked to the dissonant heritage

- Heritage site management
 Regional/urban/neighbourhood development
 Tourism/local businesses
 Culture/creative sector
 Community development/civic society
 Education/dissemination/knowledge transfer
 Pan-European networking and cooperation

Themes and questions to be covered in the interview

Part 1: General information / context		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Relation: Brief explanation of how the person/ organisation is related to the dissonant heritage/how they are involved ▪ Understanding: Brief description / perception of the dissonance, how the dissonant nature of the heritage site impacts the topic(s), their work and how they deal with it ▪ Status quo: Brief explanation how the topic is linked to dissonant heritage; what is happening/being done ▪ Achievements/impacts: Brief explanation what has been achieved through linking the dissonant heritage with the topic(s) and main reasons for the impacts ▪ Perspectives: Information if something particular is planned for the near future to develop further potential through linking the dissonant heritage with the topic(s) 		
Part 2: Detailed information about ...		
Better Knowledge	Better Regulation	Better Funding
Approaches, methods, instruments to link the topic and the dissonant heritage Cooperation & networking / Stakeholder involvement: who and how	Regulations that support the link between the topic and the dissonant heritage	Funding sources to support the link between the topic and the dissonant heritage
Guiding questions for all themes		
Status quo <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Through which approach, method, instrument is the dissonant heritage linked to the topic(s) ▪ With whom are they currently cooperating/ networking, to what extent ▪ What regulation(s) currently support the "integration" ▪ What funding sources are used so far ▪ What works well and why ▪ Does the dissonance have an impact (<i>better knowledge, better regulation, better funding</i>) 	Challenges/obstacles <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What are problems/obstacles, what is missing ▪ What needs to happen at which level with regard to the challenges Potential <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What potential / possibilities are there to improve, what further can be achieved ▪ What needs to happen at which level with regard to the potential 	
Part 3: Toolbox		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What are concrete subjects to be covered in a toolbox to promote and support integrated and collaborative development of dissonant heritage sites? ▪ Which tools (policy, procedure, instrument, good practice, etc.) would you recommend including in the toolbox according to the subjects? ▪ What would be of the most use to your organisation/site? 		

7.7 List of expert interviewees

Prof. Dr Arnold Bartetzky, Head of Culture and Imagination Department, Leibniz Institute for the History and Culture of Eastern Europe, Leipzig, Germany

Prof. Dr Patrizia Battilani, Professor in Economic History, Department of Economics and Centre for Advanced Studies in Tourism CAST, University of Bologna, Italy

Prof. Dr Carola Hein, Professor of History of Architecture and Urban Planning, Department of Architecture, TU Delft, The Netherlands

Asst. Prof. Dr Višnja Kisić, Assistant Professor, Faculty of Sport and Tourism, Novi Sad; former Secretary General of Europa Nostra Serbia, Novi Sad, Serbia

Dr Waltraud Kofler Engl, Director Cultural Heritage Centre, Department of Design and Arts, Free University of Bolzano, Bolzano, Italy

Prof. Dr Tuuli Lähdesmäki, Associate Professor of Art History, University of Jyväskylä, Finland

Prof. Dr Sharon Macdonald, Professor of Social Anthropology (with emphasis on Museums and Heritage), Humboldt University Berlin; Director of the Centre for Anthropological Research on Museums and Heritage (CARMAH), Berlin, Germany

Asst. Prof. Dr Lucja Piekarska-Duraj, Assistant UNESCO Chair for Holocaust Education, Institute of European Studies, Jagiellonian University Kraków, Poland

Prof. Dr Jacek Purchla, Head of Department of Economic and Social History and UNESCO Chair for Heritage and Urban Studies, Kraków University of Economics; Head of the Research Institute for European Heritage at the International Cultural Centre ICC, Kraków, Poland

Prof. Dr Paul Zalewski, Chair of Heritage Studies, Head of Master Course Strategies for European Cultural Heritage, European University Viadrina, Frankfurt/Oder, Germany

7.8 Interview guideline for expert interviews

Urban Agenda principle: BETTER KNOWLEDGE

Main issues of interest

- Personal assessment of state of play of dissonant heritage
- Lessons from dealing with integrated approaches to dissonant heritage (on a political/ strategic level):
 - Dissonant heritage site management
 - Urban/ neighbourhood development
 - Tourism/local businesses
 - Culture/creative sectors
 - Community development/civic society
 - Education and democracy building/dissemination/knowledge transfer

Catalogue of questions

Introduction and personal assessment

- What is your personal definition of dissonant heritage? What is the state of play according to you/in your professional context/at your working level about dealing with dissonant heritage? What are the forms of communication and networking? Is there a public debate on creating awareness of its value? What is the conceptual framework? What are the modes of remembering?
- What are the criteria to define and recognise dissonant heritage in your context? What are the core (public) debates about dissonant heritage in your regional/institutional/professional context? Are they sufficient or do they need to be extended/questioned?

Managing dissonant heritage (sites)

- Do you know positive and/or negative examples of the management of dissonant heritage (sites)?
- Who are the relevant actors, decision-makers and groups in dealing with and developing the dissonant heritage? And who is often missing and should be involved more directly?

Integrated approaches with dissonant heritage (sites)

- What is your understanding of an integrated approach? What topics or fields of activity can be connected to dissonant heritage sites effectively? Do you know any positive and/or negative example of integrated approaches in dealing with/developing dissonant heritage? What management structures support these integrated approaches?
- Who are the actors and that are particularly relevant for integrated approaches and what are their roles? Are there any public participation processes?
- What are typical obstacles and areas of potential for integrated development approaches addressing dissonant heritage?
- What integrated approaches and strategies are suitable for dealing with dissonant heritage in order to promote its functions for (urban) society, education, critical thinking, democracy-building, urban and regional development and (cultural) tourism as well as to initiate sustainable development and use?
- What approaches and methods are available, especially for endangered sites (e.g. threatened by demolition or neglect) and to improve the situation in (smaller) cities and peripheral regions?

Urban Agenda principle: BETTER REGULATION

Main issues of interest

- Instruments, methods; management structures, procedures
- Governance and regulatory levels and interaction
- Stakeholder constellations
- Strengths and weaknesses, further needs
- Recommendations on the integrated development of dissonant heritage

Catalogue of questions

Managing dissonant heritage (sites)

- What are the main challenges and risks to dissonant heritage sites?
- In your experience, what type of management of dissonant heritage sites has proven to be more appropriate or successful? How can actors and groups concerned with the management of dissonant heritage sites work on the main challenges mentioned?

Integrated approaches with dissonant heritage (sites)

- How does dissonance impact the management of dissonant heritage sites? How do those actors that are particularly relevant in integrated approaches contribute to the management of dissonant heritage sites? What can be the role and the task of these actors? Where do you see synergy effects?
- According to you, which is the most important regulatory level for dealing with dissonant heritage and the integrated approach?
 - municipal/local level
 - regional level
 - national level
 - EU level
- How do these levels interact? What are the forms of communication and cooperation? (e.g. sectoral, hierarchical, centralised, cooperative, co-productive, temporary or permanent alliances)
- How should they interact? Do you know any beneficial tools or approaches? Are they open and do they react in a flexible way to innovation and participation?
- Do you see any specific peculiarities by country or region which could be transferred to other contexts or should be avoided elsewhere?
- What are the needs for action and knowledge transfer? Do you have any recommendations to the EU, national or local level with regard to the handling and integrated development of dissonant heritage?

Urban Agenda principle: BETTER FUNDING

Main issues of interest

- Sources of funding
- Mechanisms of funding
- Models of funding
- Further needs of funding/financing
- Recommendations

Catalogue of questions

Funding dissonant heritage

- At which level are the sources of funding for dealing with dissonant heritage available? What main sources of funding (EU, national, local, etc.) are you aware of? Are you aware of any concerns about or objections to funding dissonant heritage sites at the different levels? Is this financing project-oriented and temporary or does it have a long-term time frame?
- For what purposes/activities is the funding of dissonant heritage sites predominantly needed? Are there any purposes/activities that do not currently receive funding, which you would like to have funded?
- What do you consider the main challenges for receiving funding for dissonant heritage sites?

Funding dissonant heritage and integrated approaches

- Do you know good examples of funding dissonant heritage sites and integrated approaches? If so, what are the positive or innovative elements?
- Is funding available that specifically supports the integrated approach? If so, how is it organised (assignment, competition, etc.)?

- Are you aware of any cross-sector financing from different departments, funding schemes or other sources?
- What are the needs for action and knowledge transfer? Do you have any recommendations to the EU, national or local level with regard to financing the handling and integrated development of dissonant heritage?