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Dissonant heritage in Europe

Places such as the Nazi Party Rally Grounds in Nuremberg, Germany, the Victory Monument in Bolzano, Italy, and the Mostar Bridge in Bosnia and Herzegovina are important architectural witnesses to the “dissonant” history of Europe in the 20th century and to its cultural legacy. The concept of “dissonant heritage” was introduced by John E. Tunbridge and Gregory J. Ashworth, 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. “Dissonance in heritage involves a discordance or a lack of agreement and consistency”. At these key sites of memory, European history can be experienced tangibly. The sites foster critical engagement with our history to strengthen democratic cohesion. They make it possible...
for us to situate and discuss ever-new and shifting insights and questions about our history, and they call upon us to do so.

Additionally, many smaller towns and peripheral areas of Europe are home to lesser-known heritage sites with architecturally significant buildings and sets of buildings that represent the multi-layered history of Europe in the 20th century and controversial aspects of its cultural heritage. These include heritage sites related to National Socialist, fascist, nationalist or socialist regimes and systems of government, as well as sites of and architectural witnesses to war, persecution, colonisation and propaganda. They also include post-war modernist individual buildings and sets of buildings that are distinctive in terms of architecture or urban design. These too are often perceived as “difficult” or “dissonant” heritage. Such sites, however, receive less public attention and support due to their remote location or scarce financial resources. This raises the question as to what extent integrated approaches can potentially enhance the value of these sites and can, in keeping with the notion of dissonant heritage, develop them and make them usable.

“Dissonant” in this sense should not be understood as an innate quality of the heritage but rather must always be placed in the context of social, political and historical conditions and debates. Such heritage elicits unpleasant memories and associations for society or for specific social groups, is perceived as politically and/or ethically tainted, or evokes controversial and contradictory memories and narratives. However, the ways that such heritage sites are currently used and dealt with can also lead to dissonance.

Example: Imperial District in Poznan, Poland, and “Stalin cities” in eastern and central Europe

The Imperial District in Poznan, Poland [fig. 1], is a “dissonant” heritage site that evokes divergent memories and contradictory narratives. The district was shaped over the course of three periods of history. In the first period, between 1905 and 1914, the Prussian rulers constructed new monumental buildings (such as an Imperial Castle) with the idea of developing Poznan into an eastern German capital city and establishing a German “presence”. In the second period, during the Second World War, the Nazi regime first converted the castle into a residence for Adolf Hitler and then used it as the headquarters for the local Nazi leader (Gauleiter). During the third period, the Imperial District was the site of workers’ protests in 1956 and demonstrations by the student movement and the Solidarity movement in the 1970s and 1980s, which fought for Poland’s freedom and independence from the Soviet Union. The first of these three periods reflects the Prussian occupation; at the same time, the site that was established in Poznan was of high quality in terms of urban design and Baukultur. The second period marks the – comparatively short – era of Nazi occupation and atrocities. The third period is connected with positive memories and symbols, and dominates the public perception of the site and narrative surrounding it. It largely overshadows the memories of and engagement with the first and second periods.
The “socialist planned cities” in eastern and central Europe, such as the “Stalin cities” Eisenhüttenstadt in Germany, the former “Stalinstadt”, and Dunaújváros in Hungary, the former “Sztálinváros”, both founded in 1951, and the socialist cities Dimitrovgrad in Bulgaria, founded in 1947, and the Nowa Huta district of Krakow, Poland founded in 1949, likewise evoke contradictory memories and narratives: as once-modern places where the “workers” who in some cases helped build these sites had their homes and social environment, but also as symbolic sites of propaganda for the socialist system, which are tied to negative memories and associations.

Controversial or uncomfortable aspects of heritage sites often do not receive sufficient public attention or support, which is in some cases the deliberate result of political decisions. In many places in Europe, this dissonant heritage has been neglected, is inaccessible to the public or is threatened with demolition and decay, or its controversial elements are shrouded in silence. In some cases, this is due to a lack of administrative or financial resources.

Example: The former Ustasha concentration camp on Pag Island, Croatia, and the Valley of the Fallen near Madrid, Spain

The Ustasha concentration camp on Pag Island in Croatia [fig. 2] and the Valley of the Fallen (Valle de los Caidos) near Madrid in Spain represent, among other things, the nationalist and fascist atrocities committed in these countries. Jews, Communists and Serbs were the main groups imprisoned in Ustasha during the Second World War, whereas high-ranking figures in the Franco regime were buried at an imposing
memorial complex in the Valley of the Fallen. This is, however, also the location of mass graves of victims of the Franco regime, who are not commemorated at the site. In both cases, the former regime in question is still supported in some political quarters and some segments of society. This makes it more difficult to grapple with the complex events that shaped these sites. The complexity in these two cases is augmented by the fact that condemnable events took place, but due to existing political continuities they are supposed to remain under the cloak of silence, even after decades. This intermingling of today’s political agendas with incidents from the past makes it difficult to deal with the past and to draw lessons from it for the future in order to strengthen democratic structures.

Figure 2

![ Former Ustasha concentration camp Slana (Pag Island, Croatia) – structural remains, 2021. © Valerija Grigora. ](image)

Action is urgently needed in order to secure and recognise these historically and architecturally significant sites and their structural elements, and to interpret and develop them in a sustainable way for the future generations. These are crucial sites for memory and for confronting dissonant European history and the multi-faceted narratives and perspectives that the sites generate. At the same time, they have the potential to support urban and regional development by boosting areas such as tourism, culture and education.

**Example: Martyr village of Oradour-sur-Glane and Struthof Concentration Camp, France**

At two French memorial sites, the martyr village of Oradour-sur-Glane, where the local population was massacred by a Waffen-SS company in 1944, and the Natzweiler-Struthof concentration camp, a prison and work camp in the occupied Alsace region of France during the Second World War, the remaining structural elements are preserved.
and maintained, and many facets of the history are documented and presented to visitors at the memorial sites, including the French role in what happened there. At the same time, these sites are used to support urban and regional development through tourism, education and culture. Financial support comes from the national and regional levels: The memorial site of Oradour-sur-Glane is financially supported by the Département Haute-Vienne and the preservation of the ruins by the French Ministry of Culture; Natzweiler-Struthof is supported by the Ministry of the Armed Forces and the Office national des anciens combattants et victimes de guerre [fig. 3 et 4].

Figure 3

Martyr village Oradour (France) – main street, 2011.
© Centre de la Mémoire d’Oradour-sur-Glane.
The Urban Agenda for the EU: a multi-level approach to dissonant heritage

Since 2016, the Urban Agenda for the EU (UAEU)³ has had 14 thematic partnerships with specific Actions that, for the first time, address innovative themes related to European cities in a close dialogue among the EU, the member states, cities and regions. New solutions, approaches and prospects are developed for the urban dimension of social challenges in topic areas such as urban mobility, sustainable land use and the shift to green energy. The Partnership on Culture and Cultural Heritage (CCHP, 2019–2022) of the UAEU is being jointly coordinated by Germany and Italy⁴. In 11 Actions, it is developing political and strategic recommendations for better knowledge, better regulation and better funding in this field.

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 can Buzludzha, a place of historical importance for many Bulgarians, 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 rose tradition? 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”, thus
connecting the dissonant heritage to urban and regional development as well as tourism.

Action 10 examines the challenges and opportunities of the dissonant heritage of the 20th century in smaller towns and peripheral regions of Europe. It seeks to expand perspectives on these sites and generate broader public awareness in Europe. Starting from the Urban Agenda and its multilevel approach, the Action especially engages with integrated, place-based approaches to dealing with and developing dissonant heritage sites. The integrated approaches aim to include relevant stakeholders horizontally and vertically and to connect the preservation of these cultural heritage sites with other fields of activity such as education (both in and beyond the classroom), tourism, culture, civic engagement and urban and regional development.

The accompanying research project “Integrated Approaches to Dissonant Heritage in Europe” since April 2021 has explored the potential of dissonant heritage for urban and regional development as well as ways to implement integrated approaches. The project (BBSR 2021) is part of the Experimental Housing and Urban Development (ExWoSt) programme of the Federal Institute for Research on Building, Urban Affairs and Spatial Development (BBSR) and Germany’s Federal Ministry for Housing, Urban Development and Building (BMWSB).

The potential of dissonant European heritage

The often competing and ambiguous ways of interpreting dissonant heritage due to different perceptions and personal or political attitudes towards the events that took place there demand a sensitive, cautious and integrated approach that involves different stakeholders in dealing with the dissonant heritage and its development. Despite their complexity and practical challenges, dissonant heritage sites play important roles or have the potential to do so.

They can help to make history and past events tangible and accessible, and can encourage reflection on them. What people learn from this can contribute to a free and just future, and can strengthen democratic social systems. This is the democracy-building and educational role dissonant heritage sites can take on.

Example: Imparting dissonant heritage with school classes in Forlì, Italy, and Labin, Croatia

Forlì, Italy, and Labin, Croatia, are both members of the Cultural Route of the Council of Europe Atrium - Architecture of Totalitarian Regimes of the XXth Century in Europe's Urban Memory [fig. 5]. As a way to convey dissonant heritage, over the course of a school year, pupils in Forlì developed fictional stories about two young people during the Fascist era. When the Croatian school class visited Forlì, these stories were shared with them, together with a guided audio tour through the town centre, which highlighted places representative of the town’s Fascist architectural heritage that are also a part of the Italian pupils’ present-day living environment. As an Atrium Go! project receiving EU funding, the project featured guidance for the pupils from a cultural organisation that works with young people on dissonant heritage. The co-
design of the audio guide generated new perspectives on the city's history and sparked wide-ranging debates on site in Forlì among both the Italian and the Croatian pupils.

Figure 5

![Flight mosaics in former military College of Aeronautics, Forlì (Italy), 2013.](image)
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Engaging with the history on site can help groups affected by discrimination, stigmatisation or persecution to process the past and to remember it. This is the memory role dissonant heritage sites can take on.

Such sites can also be used for a societal dialogue and for engagement with the site in order to build bridges and enable many different voices from different segments of society and different positions within a democratic set of values to be heard. This is the socio-political role dissonant heritage sites can take on.

**Example: Confronting the colonial legacy in Leuven, Belgium**

In many countries, the Black Lives Matter movement has called for the removal of monuments dedicated to colonialist figures. In a participatory process, the population of Leuven was asked to take part in finding ways to deal with the colonial monuments in public spaces. In this process, simply removing the monuments was ruled out as a solution from the outset. Guided decolonisation walking tours and media-friendly events were held in order to raise public awareness of the issue and the debates surrounding it. This was followed by a call in 2020 by the City of Leuven for the public to submit ideas for dealing with the legacy of colonialism in public spaces. Ideas were collected and publicly discussed via an online platform. In the end, members of the public could vote on the ideas. In parallel to this, a citywide jury discussed and evaluated the submissions. Both the jury and the public had a maximum number of points they were able to award. The projects that received the most votes from the jury and the public were selected to be pursued further and implemented. The selected
projects are: Integrated, interactive decolonisation walks, murals about decolonisation, a monument for the victims and for resistance heroes, continuous dialogue-inducing benches on decolonisation and a yearly theme day on decolonisation.

Dissonant heritage can also provide important impetus for making a place an attractive location and a destination for (cultural) tourism, especially in smaller towns and peripheral regions. For example, heritage sites such as the Monument House of the Bulgarian Communist Party - Buzludzha in Kazanlak, built from 1974 to 1981 and designed by Georgi Stoilov, and the Imperial District in Poznan have become magnets for tourism in their regions (half a million visitors annually in Poznan and 50,000 people annually in Buzludzha). In some cases, the dissonant heritage sites are also linked to the marketing of further tourist attractions and activities in the region. This is the economic role dissonant heritage sites can take on.

As part of integrated urban development, participatory processes for adapting the present-day use of the dissonant heritage sites can contribute to a sense of local identity and to resilient cities and districts. Specialists in the field, planners and architects, and stakeholders from the world of arts and culture pursue such approaches as part of urban restructuring that is focused on the existing built environment. Amplifying these voices and forging alliances is a potential way to bring dissonant heritage sites into the future. This is the urban development policy role dissonant heritage sites can take on.

**Example: Former prison of La Modelo in Barcelona, Spain**

In La Modelo prison, thousands of political prisoners were held in overcrowded cells during the Franco regime, and some were executed. In the course of a transformative urban renewal process, the centrally located and highly symbolic building from the early 20th century is receiving a new use that is fitting for the somewhat divergent interests of the district and its residents, the city, the investors and an initiative dedicated to culture of remembrance. Through an integrative participation process and the opening of the site to the residents, participants reflected on the future and use of the site and developed a multi-functional use that was designed to meet different needs. The former prison complex will provide space for private dwellings and public amenities, including a nursery school, as well as green space for the residents of the neighbourhood. One part of the complex will be dedicated to preserving the memory of what happened in the prison.\(^\text{10}\)
Integrated approaches to dissonant heritage: Findings of the accompanying study

As part of the accompanying research project, an empirical survey was conducted in summer 2021 using a mixture of methods: an online survey of 40 dissonant heritage sites, 42 in-depth case study interviews and ten qualitative expert interviews in Europe.

The study proposes distinguishing among different categories of dissonant heritage sites such as

• places dominated by atrocities, for example concentration camps;
• places which symbolically or otherwise represent a repressive system, but where no atrocities have taken place, for example the Monument House of the Bulgarian Communist Party - Buzludzha in Kazanlak, Bulgaria;
• and places where both positive and “difficult” events have taken place, but the more positive events are foregrounded, for example the Imperial District in Poznan, Poland.

The dissonant heritage sites are also at different stages of engaging with their dissonant heritage and adopting integrated approaches. In some places, remembrance and engagement with dissonant heritage sites and their preservation and development receive public, societal and political support, while in other places, such heritage sites fall into obscurity and their stories and events are repressed or are presented only in a one-sided manner. Many other heritage sites lie somewhere between these two extremes. There is a continuum of dissonance, in which sites are interpreted and
evaluated in different ways over the course of time (as is the case, for example, in the current post-colonialism debate).

What all these sites have in common, however, is their (potential) significance and role as (educational) places of communication, awareness-raising, memory and debate to strengthen democratic processes and ways of thinking. These places are well suited for such a role, as they can convey the dissonant histories and events of the 20th century in Europe not merely through images or stories, but in an up-close, tangible way, and can inspire new discourses.

In this process, memory, communication and awareness-raising take priority and (should) become the focus of attention. Architectural preservation is an important means to achieve this aim and is to be aligned with this main task. In this way, it will particularly serve to better convey what the site represents and what history or histories it recalls. However, long-term preservation often also requires a strategy for further developing the heritage site.

The survey illustrates that integrated approaches in particular support this function:

- through increased and coordinated cooperation among the local, regional and national levels. All of the stakeholders contribute their specific resources in order to preserve and maintain the dissonant heritage and to develop the sites into places of awareness-raising, memory and public discussion.

Example: Borderland Museum Eichsfeld, Germany

In Eichsfeld, stakeholders from the local to the state level as well as international institutions and networks were included in a years-long process of jointly defining which part of the boundary installations along the former border between East and West Germany were to be preserved and how history was to be commemorated at the site. This process was able to gain the support of many. This led to broad political and societal recognition of this heritage site as well as to the founding of a sponsoring association that cares for the heritage site and to long-term financing from the local and state level. Through support from local institutions and collaboration with them (especially schools), the Borderland Museum\textsuperscript{11} has developed into a well-established place of learning and discussion, where dissonant heritage and the historical context and background are conveyed in a tangible way, and where interested individuals and organisations can enter into conversation with one another about the history and perception of the internal German border [fig. 7];
Through more extensive networks and cooperation at European level, e.g. through transnational networks such as Atrium (https://www.atriumroute.eu/), Atlantikwall Europe (https://www.atlantikwalleurope.eu/) or Iron Curtain – European Green Belt (https://www.europeangreenbelt.org/), in order to advance the dissonant heritage and integrated approaches locally. The European dimension makes it possible to view one’s own dissonant heritage differently and fosters a learning process of engaging with different attitudes towards dissonant heritage and different historical layers of heritage sites.

Example: The Monument House of the Bulgarian Communist Party - Buzludzha in Kazanlak, Bulgaria

Through cooperation with national and international experts and networks, such as ICOMOS and the European Investment Bank Institute, a vision was developed for the heritage site in Kazanlak that illustrates the different perspectives and histories of the site and – through guided tours and a festival – draws local people’s attention to the heritage site in all its multi-vocal facets. Cooperation with international experts and organisations has created local awareness of and interest in the heritage site and opened up new perspectives. Thus, the heritage site is no longer regarded as an “undesirable” symbol of the former Bulgarian Communist ruling party, but rather as an architecturally significant building that merits preservation and is a source of some positive memories for the local population [fig. 8].
By connecting the dissonant heritage with other sectors and fields such as education, tourism, culture and social engagement. This strengthens engagement with the dissonant heritage from a variety of perspectives and makes it possible to involve a larger range of stakeholders in the integrated development and to tap into additional potential for support and funding.

Example: Atlantikwall Raversyde heritage site, Belgium

Located beside the sea, this site was the location of bunkers of the German defensive line in the Second World War. The striking contrast between the brutalist abandoned bunkers and the beautiful beach landscape surrounding them has inspired artists to use it as a backdrop for presenting their work – without, however, addressing the site’s dissonance and history. Nonetheless, with each further art project, the artists came a step closer to the site’s past, and they began to increasingly reflect on it in their artworks [fig. 9].
Looking forward in Europe

31 The European Commission introduced the model of multi-level partnerships as part of the Urban Agenda for the EU. The Ljubljana Agreement, adopted under the Slovenian Presidency in November 2021 (Slovenian Presidency 2021), affirmed this model and bolstered it for the future. One of its core elements is the implementation of the five principles of the European reference document of the EU Member States on sustainable urban development, the New Leipzig Charter (Informal Ministerial Meeting 2020): urban policy for the common good, an integrated approach, participation and co-production, multi-level governance and a place-based approach.

32 The integrated approach of the Urban Agenda has proven to be an important instrument for dealing with dissonant heritage in Europe, as it leads to interdisciplinary and multi-level debates as well as to new alliances and forms of cooperation and to increased attention throughout Europe. The European experts who were involved in Action 10 stated how important it was to achieve a broad ongoing dialogue and to better anchor dissonant heritage sites in structural terms from different levels (local, regional, national, European), especially under the conditions that prevail in smaller towns and peripheral regions, often in need of consistent administrative and financial resources. Transnational (exchange) activities, some of which take place within existing formats and institutions, should heighten awareness of lesser-known dissonant heritage sites, incorporate a European perspective into local discussions and demonstrate the advantages of preserving and further developing dissonant heritage sites and integrated approaches.
The findings of the accompanying study and the recommendations were discussed and developed further at an international expert workshop in October 2021 and within an Online Forum in February 2022 where a dedicated homepage (www.dissonant-heritage.eu) has been launched. An Orientation Paper lays the groundwork for further European efforts on integrated approaches to dissonant heritage (Potz & Scheffler 2022). A toolbox for local use in practice is expected to be released in early 2025.

Dissonant heritage as a shared European theme in promoting democracy requires strong public awareness and political recognition. In future, the Action partners want to serve as multipliers and expand the group to make space for multi-vocal history and a culture of remembrance, as well as for reflecting on the current built environment – for example, the dissonant legacy of our present-day fossil-fuel-dependent culture as the potential “dissonant heritage of tomorrow”.

The findings and recommendations of the Urban Agenda Partnership on Culture and Cultural Heritage are being submitted to the European Commission and are to be incorporated into EU policy. Links between the New European Bauhaus (BMI/BBSR 2021) and other relevant initiatives are also being pursued. Attention at European level creates new opportunities for exchange and cooperation and potential access to funding. It makes it possible to reach a growing circle of stakeholders and decision-makers and mobilise them on behalf of the integrated development of dissonant heritage sites.
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10. The prison La Modelo is part of the European Observatory on Memories (EUROM), Barcelona, which is managed by the Barcelona University Solidarity Foundation since 2012 and funded by
the EU Commission. It gathers 53 partners from more than 20 countries, many of them dissonant heritage sites, with a transnational perspective and an interdisciplinary approach (https://europeanmemories.net [link valid in February 2023]).

11. See https://www.grenzlandmuseum.de/ [link valid in February 2023]

ABSTRACTS

Dissonant heritage sites represent the many layers of 20th century European history as well as the controversial forms of cultural heritage. Within the Partnership on Culture and Cultural Heritage and its action “Integrated Approaches to Dissonant Heritage”, the Urban Agenda for the EU focuses on potential ways for enhancing the value of 20th century dissonant heritage sites in small towns and peripheral regions of Europe through various integrated approaches.

Participating in the Partnership of the Urban Agenda plays is key to raising the public’s awareness of dissonant heritage, and the potential it holds in Europe. An accompanying study and the recommendations that have been developed in February of 2022 show that dissonant heritage sites can help strengthen democracy, education, tourism and sustainable urban and regional development. It is important to make the public aware of dissonant heritage sites and their potential by increasing and coordinating collaboration at the local, regional and national levels; intensifying links and cooperation at the European level; and connecting dissonant heritage with other areas such as education (in and beyond schools), culture, social engagement, and urban or regional planning. Such processes should place greater emphasis on framework conditions in smaller towns and peripheral areas of Europe.

Les sites du patrimoine que l’on peut qualifier de « dissonant » illustrent l’histoire multidimensionnelle de l’Europe au xx\textsuperscript{e} siècle et les aspects controversés de son héritage culturel. Dans le cadre du partenariat pour la culture et le patrimoine culturel, l’action « Approches intégrées du patrimoine dissonant » de l’Agenda urbain pour l’UE est centrée sur la mise en valeur du potentiel des sites patrimoniaux dissonants du xx\textsuperscript{e} siècle dans les petites villes d’Europe et ses régions éloignées.

La participation à ce partenariat de l’Agenda urbain joue un rôle clé pour accroître la sensibilisation du public au patrimoine dissonant et au potentiel qu’il recèle en Europe. L’étude associée et les recommandations formulées en février 2022 montrent que les sites de ce patrimoine détiennent un potentiel important pour aider au renforcement de la démocratie, de l’éducation, du tourisme et au développement durable des villes et des régions. Il est important de sensibiliser le public à ces sites et à leur potentiel par une collaboration coordonnée et renforcée aux niveaux local, régional et national, par une mise en réseau et une coopération plus intensives au niveau européen et par la mise en relation du patrimoine dissonant avec d’autres secteurs : éducation (au sein et au-delà de l’école), culture, engagement social, planification des
villes et des régions. De tels processus devraient insister sur la condition particulière des petites villes et régions reculées de l'Europe.
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