

**ICOMOS
DISCUSSION PAPER**

**Evaluations of World Heritage Nominations
related to
Sites Associated with
Memories of Recent Conflicts**



Contents

1. *Rationale for Discussion Paper*
 2. *Background*
 3. *Defining recent conflicts and sites associated with memory*
 4. *The World Heritage Convention and sites associated with memories of recent conflicts*
 5. *Issues raised by sites associated with memories of recent conflicts in relation to the World Heritage Convention*
 6. *Inscribed, nominated and Tentative list sites associated with memories of recent conflicts*
 7. *Challenges of evaluating sites associated with memories of recent conflicts*
 8. *Conclusions and Recommendations*
- Annex *Details of Inscribed, Nominated, and Tentative List sites associated with memories of recent conflicts*

1. Rationale for Discussion Paper

In response to concerns that a number of World Heritage nominations might be submitted in the near future related to sites associated with memories of comparatively recent conflicts, and in the absence of clear parameters for how such sites relate to the World Heritage Convention, the World Heritage Centre has initiated two working groups, one on the interpretation of sites of memory (not confined to World Heritage properties) and the second on the use of criterion (vi).

This discussion paper complements these studies and offers an ICOMOS perspective on evaluation of sites associated with the memories of recent conflicts in relation to the World Heritage Convention. It considers how the World Heritage Committee has considered such sites in the past, and the issues that they raise in relation to Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) and the idea of commonality.

The evaluation of sites associated with memories of recent conflicts raises fundamental issues relating to the purpose and scope of the World Heritage Convention and how its notion of commonality might be satisfied. There are difficulties with evaluating memories which inherently are still evolving or partisan in one way or another, or where memory is re-invested with retrospective 'truths'. These sites also might raise inconsistencies between OUV that is fixed at the time of inscription and the dynamic and political realities of the wider post-conflict processes for sites associated with recent conflicts. Difficulties arise, too, with undertaking comparative analyses for sites related to conflicts that covered large parts of the globe and/or resulted in the deaths of thousands or even millions of people, in terms of undertaking meaningful comparisons of the tragedy and loss which gives such sites their significance.

The paper concludes that the World Heritage Committee might wish to consider convening an Expert Meeting (or a series of meetings) on sites associated with memories of recent conflicts to allow for both philosophical and practical reflections on the nature of memorialization, the value of evolving memories, the inter-relationship between material and immaterial attributes in relation to memory, how meaningful comparisons of tragedy and loss might be undertaken and the issue of stakeholder consultation, as a prelude to the development of guidance on whether and how sites associated with memories of recent conflicts might relate to the purpose and scope of the World Heritage Convention, and perhaps more widely to an understanding as to whether World Heritage inscription that fixes OUV at the time of inscription might sit uncomfortably with the wider complex and shifting dynamics of post-conflict processes.

Although this paper relates only to World Heritage, it is suggested that the issues it highlights have a much wider resonance.

2. Background

The first of several sites related to the First World War, "Funeral and memorial sites of the First World War (Western Front)" (Belgium and France), has now been submitted for evaluation. More sites on Tentative Lists are being worked on, such as, for instance, cemeteries and battlefields in Slovenia, while sites related to the Normandy beach landings of the Second World War are being prepared for submission in 2018 as Les Plages du Débarquement, Normandie, 1944 (France). Four sites related to genocide in Rwanda, selected from the many hundreds that exist, were the subject of a Workshop in Kigali in 2016 and will also be nominated shortly as "Sites mémoriaux du génocide: Nyamata, Murambi, Gisozi et Bisesero" (Rwanda). Currently there are some 10 sites on Tentative Lists from 10 States Parties associated with memories of recent conflicts of one sort or another.

The scope and scale these potential nominations, many of which are series consisting of large numbers of individual sites, some trans-national, and the considerable resources being directed to them, reflect a growing interest in sites associated with memories of recent conflicts and the high profile being given to some of them at a national level.

At the same time, the tools that exist to evaluate these types of properties are to a degree inadequate for the challenges that they reflect. This is not because of the scope or scale of the nominations, but because these nominations raise questions related to the purpose and scope of the World Heritage Convention.

3. Defining recent conflicts and sites associated with memory

Conflicts

In the context of this paper, the term conflict is defined as covering wars, battles, massacres, genocide and other negative events involving opposing views of several parties. It does not encompass sites associated with slavery or liberation movements, although it is acknowledged that some of the issues raised are relevant for such sites.

Recent Conflicts

The word 'recent' in relation to conflicts, in the context of this paper, has been taken to refer to conflicts of the 20th and 21st centuries.

Sites associated with memory

The term 'Sites associated with memory' in the context of this paper is used for sites where it is the memory or memories that primarily give or gives the property its main value, or its potential Outstanding Universal Value (OUV). The place or site associated with the memory thus may be incidental to the source of the memory— such as where a battle, trauma, massacre, genocide or other event happened to occur. This could mean that what is nominated is a site that before the event had other uses such as a school, field, offices, etc., but where the value of those structures and uses are now overshadowed by memories of the event.

It should be recalled that the OUV of many if not most World Heritage properties are associated with 'ideas', some of which in turn could be related to memory, such as historical or religious associations and traditional uses and ceremonies. As World Heritage cultural properties are essentially inscribed as places, it is the place or site that is considered outstanding for the way it reflects ideas and association and which should manifest the attributes that convey its OUV.

Properties inscribed solely under criterion (vi) might be considered to be exceptions in that for this criterion to be justified it is the events, living traditions, ideas, beliefs, or artistic and literary works with which they are associated that must be seen as of outstanding universal significance, although the property must still be directly or tangibly associated with these ideas and convey OUV. This emphasis on the value of the idea under criterion (vi) is why the World Heritage Committee considers that ideas must be directly or tangibly linked to the property and also that this criterion should preferably be used in conjunction with other criteria in order to ensure the place itself can be defined as outstanding in some way.

The recent growth of interest in sites of associated with memory, and particularly sites associated with the memories of recent conflicts, is bringing sharply into focus the need to clarify the use of criterion (vi), in relation to direct and tangible links, but over and above to clarify difficult and complex issues relating to how negative memories can and should be evaluated.

4. The World Heritage Convention and sites associated with memories of recent conflicts

The inscriptions of Auschwitz Concentration Camp, Poland, in 1979 and the Hiroshima Peace Memorial (Genbaku Dome), Japan, in 1996 highlight the way sites associated with the memory of recent major conflicts have long been considered sensitive by the World Heritage Committee. Their concerns reflect two main issues related to what might be called commonality and neutrality.

The World Heritage Convention recognises distinctiveness and cultural differences but what sets it apart from other Conventions is the idea that inscribed properties are part of the heritage of humankind and thus also reflect the idea of a commonality of interests.

The definition of OUV adopted in the 2005 revision of the *Operational Guidelines for the implementation of the World Heritage Convention* reflects this idea of commonality. Outstanding Universal Value is defined in paragraph 49 as "cultural and/or natural significance which is so exceptional as to transcend national boundaries and to be of common importance for present and future generations of all humanity. As such, the permanent protection of this heritage is of the highest importance to the international community as a whole". [*emphasis added*].

Commonality – that is the relevance of properties to the whole of humanity – is thus central to the World Heritage Convention as set out in the definition of OUV in the *Operational Guidelines*. That being the case, how can “common importance for.....all humanity” encompass specifically national or regional celebrations of recent or continuing conflicts? And is it possible for distinctiveness and cultural differences, which the World Heritage Convention also celebrates to contribute to commonality without highlighting nationalism or still recent divisions? If history is acknowledged as never being neutral, then neither are conflicts: one side wins the others loose, and narratives associated with sites of negative memory can also be partial. Should the World Heritage Convention be an instrument for celebrating the winners of recent conflicts and their version of history?

Both these issues were raised at the time Auschwitz Concentration Camp, Poland, was inscribed in 1979 under criterion (vi) for the way it offered ‘... irrefutable and concrete witness to one of the greatest crimes which has been perpetrated against humanity’. The Committee at that time ‘decided to enter Auschwitz concentration camp on the List as a unique site and to restrict the inscription of other sites of a similar nature’. [*emphasis added*].

The background paper for the World Heritage Committee (Report by Michel Parent-CC- 79/CONF.003/11 ANNEX) suggested that ‘in order to preserve its symbolic status as a monument to all the victims, Auschwitz should, it seems, remain in isolation. In other words, we recommend that it should stand alone among cultural properties as bearing witness to the depth of horror and of suffering, and the height of heroism, and that all other sites of the same nature be symbolized through it’. And more generally it added that ‘sites representing the positive and negative sides of human history will only be invested with real force if we make the most remarkable into unique symbols, each one standing for the whole series of similar events. On this principle, Auschwitz would be placed on the List, but would not be a precedent for a whole series of similar sites’.

The World Heritage Committee also noted in its discussion that: ‘Nominations concerning, in particular, historical events or famous people could be strongly influenced by nationalism or other particularism in contradiction with the objectives of the World Heritage Convention’. (CC-79-CONF.003-13/35)

Similar concerns were again raised in 1996 when the Hiroshima Peace Memorial (Genbaku Dome), Japan, was inscribed, also under criterion (vi) as a ‘stark and powerful symbol of the achievement of world peace for more than half a century following the unleashing of the most destructive force ever created by humankind’, the wording taken from ICOMOS’s recommendation.

Prior to the decision, both the States Parties of China and the United States of America expressed their concerns (Annex V of the World Heritage Committee report (WHC-96/CONF.201/21)). The Delegation of China presented a written statement that touched on the rawness of the events associated with the Hiroshima Peace Memorial and the partiality with which it might be viewed. The statement read: "During the Second World War, it was the other Asian countries and peoples who suffered the greatest loss in life and property. But today there are still few people trying to deny this fact of history. As such being the case, if Hiroshima nomination is approved to be included on the World Heritage List, even though on an exceptional basis, it may be utilized for harmful purpose by these few people. This will, of course, not be conducive to the safeguarding of world peace and security. For this reason China has reservations on the approval of this nomination."

The United States of America also dissociated itself from the decision to inscribe the property on the World Heritage List. It was concerned at the lack of historical perspective in the nomination of Genbaku Dome as ‘the events antecedent to the United States’ use of atomic weapons to end World War II are key to understanding the tragedy of Hiroshima. Any examination of the period leading up to 1945 should be placed in the appropriate historical context’. It also considered that ‘the inscription of war sites [lies] outside the scope of the Convention. We urge the Committee to address the question of the suitability of war sites for the World Heritage List’. [*emphasis added*] **Such a reflection has not so far been undertaken.**

The lack of commonality has also contributed to nominated sites of conflict not being successfully inscribed. An example is the ensemble of the Warrior’s Cemetery and Monument to Freedom in Riga, Latvia, nominated in 1991. This consisted of two component sites: the Warriors’ Cemetery and the Monument to Freedom. The Warriors’ Cemetery commemorated those who had died during World War I and the fight for independence (1918-1920) during which one-third of the Latvian population perished. In its evaluation, ICOMOS recognized ‘the obvious national importance of these related sites’ but did not consider that they had ‘sufficient international significance to merit inclusion’. The World Heritage Committee agreed. (CONF 002 XV.C).

A further example is Gdańsk – The Site of Memory and Freedom, Poland, nominated in 2006. In its evaluation, ICOMOS recommended not to inscribe and noted that ‘As an ensemble constituting a serial nomination to the World Heritage List, ICOMOS considers that the outstanding universal values of sites of memory and freedom have not been sufficiently demonstrated.’ The nomination was withdrawn at the request of the concerned State Party, (31 COM 8B.43).

5. Issues raised by sites associated with memories of recent conflicts in relation to the World Heritage Convention

As there are other instruments that can reflect memories such as the Convention on Intangible Cultural Heritage, 2003¹, which recognises sites associated with living memories, the UNESCO Memory of the World Programme², which recognises the importance of documentary heritage in promoting the sharing of knowledge for greater understanding and dialogue, in order to promote peace and respect for freedom, democracy, human rights and dignity, Sites of Conscience³, which recognises sites as places of memory, including traumatic memory, and the European Heritage Label⁴, which recognises the symbolic value of the sites that have played a role in European history or other European activities, it becomes important to identify whether and if it is appropriate for the World Heritage Convention to inscribe places associated with memories of conflict.

In relation to the World Heritage Convention, the examples set out above associated with memories of recent conflicts can be seen to raise the following issues:

- As memorialization of recent conflicts may often be defined by politics or by the most influential of several groups each of whom insists on their own set of “truths”, and where the narrative might be partial, a re-investment of memory, or a promotion of political ideas, how might the World Heritage Committee decide on the validity of one memory of a conflict over another?
- Where the memories of recent conflicts associated with an individual site, or series of sites, may not be neutral, how might they be seen as having a shared importance for the whole of humanity and reflect the commonality of World Heritage? This issue has been highlighted in the World Heritage Committee decisions mentioned above.
- As memorials reflecting a particular version of events can sometimes contribute to deeper divisions rather than to social and political reconstruction, should the World Heritage Convention be used to inscribe sites as memorials to recent conflicts where the memory could be partial or reflect ‘new truths’ and where the site might be considered divisive in ‘recognising’ certain factions associated with the conflict which has, or had, both winners and losers? These matters relate to cautions already expressed by the World Heritage Committee, as mentioned above.
- As many recent conflicts remain unresolved after the main actions have finished and time is needed for reflection on their meaning, should sites associated with recent conflicts be considered only after sufficient time has elapsed for shared values to emerge? The World Heritage Committee has previously expressed nervousness about inscribing examples of 20th century heritage before sufficient time has elapsed for reflection on their worth. How long is needed for social reflection to take place and historical perspective to

¹ The Convention on Intangible Cultural Heritage, 2003, is aimed at safeguarding the uses, representations, expressions, knowledge and techniques that communities, groups and, in some cases, individuals, recognise as an integral part of their cultural heritage. This intangible heritage is found in forms such as oral traditions, performing arts, social practices, rituals, festive events, knowledge and practices concerning nature and the universe, and traditional craftsmanship knowledge and techniques, and it may also comprise the instruments, goods, objects of art and cultural spaces inherent to intangible cultural heritage.

² The UNESCO Memory of the World Programme was established in 1992 to facilitate, **with due recognition of cultural mores and practicalities**, the preservation of the world’s documentary heritage and to assist in making it universally accessible.

³ The International Coalition of Sites of Conscience, founded in 1999, recognises sites as places of memory – such as an historic site, place-based museum or memorial – that prevents loss of memory in order to ensure a more just and humane future. Not only do Sites of Conscience provide safe spaces to remember and preserve even the most traumatic memories, but they enable their visitors to make connections between the past and related contemporary human rights issues.

⁴ European Heritage Label recognises the symbolic value of sites that have played a role in European history or other European activities and have the potential to bring the European Union and its citizens closer together.

develop so that the narratives associated with memories of recent conflict are largely accepted by all? And might the timeframe be culture-dependent?

- Where conflicts involve large parts of the globe and/or resulted in the deaths of thousands or even millions of people, and as comparative analyses cannot be undertaken meaningfully on the tragedy and loss which give sites associated with these events their significance, how could the World Heritage Committee refrain from inscribing all sites associated with such conflicts once one site had been seen to justify inscription?

It is apposite to note that some of these issues are being raised in relation to the Memory of the World Programme. At the recent meeting of the UNESCO Memory of the World Committee (Paris, 24-27 October 2017) 'Member States called upon the Director-General, the members of the IAC [International Advisory Committee], and all stakeholders of the MoW [Memory of the World Programme] to abide by the principles of dialogue, mutual understanding and respect and to avoid further political tensions concerning the MoW Programme'.

6. *Inscribed, Nominated and Tentative list sites associated with memories of recent conflicts*

The following sites illustrate some of these key issues. They include sites that have been inscribed, have been nominated or are on Tentative Lists. The examples are not exhaustive. Details of most of the sites are set out in the Annex.

Up until now there have only been three properties inscribed that relate to memories of recent conflicts. These are Auschwitz, Poland, 1979, the Hiroshima Peace Memorial (Genbaku Dome), Japan, 1996 and Bikini Atoll Nuclear Test Site, Marshall Islands (2010).

For all of these there is tangible fabric that reflects their value. In recent years, a considerable number of sites have been included in Tentative Lists relating to memories of recent conflicts where the balance between tangible and intangible evidence has moved towards the latter.

The sites now included in Tentative Lists reflect the following themes related to recent conflicts:

- *World War 1– sites from Slovenia, Belgium and France, Turkey:*
 - Funeral and memorial sites of the First World War (Western Front), Belgium and France (nominated)
 - The Walk of Peace from the Alps to the Adriatic – Heritage of the First World War, Slovenia
 - Çanakkale (Dardanelles) and Gelibolu (Gallipoli) Battles Zones in the First World War, Turkey
- *World War II – sites from France and Russian Federation*
 - Les Plages du Débarquement, Normandie, 1944, France
 - Mamayev Kurgan Memorial Complex "To the Heroes of the Battle of Stalingrad", Russian Federation
- *War against apartheid – site from Angola*
 - Cuito Cuanavale, Site de Libération et Indépendance, Angola – monument to a battle by Angolans and Cubans against the former apartheid regime in South Africa.
- *Civil war – serial site from Rwanda*
 - Sites mémoriaux du génocide : Nyamata, Murambi, Bisesero et Gisozi, Rwanda
- *Torture sites & jails – Argentina, Campo Verde, India*
 - ESMA Site Museum - Former Clandestine Centre of Detention, Torture, and Extermination, Argentina
 - Camp de concentration du Tarrafal, Capo Verde – camp built as a prison camp and for extermination
 - Cellular Jail, Andaman Islands, India – for political dissidents

7. Challenges of evaluating sites associated with memories of recent conflicts

The issues set out above, and the Tentative List sites illustrating those issues, highlight the challenges that will be faced by ICOMOS and the World Heritage Committee in defining and evaluating sites associated with memories of recent conflicts that have been nominated or are likely to be nominated in the next five years. These challenges include the following:

1. As World Heritage sites need to be preserved as part of the heritage of humankind as a whole, under what circumstances might sites associated with memories of recent regional or local conflicts be seen to have a commonality for the whole of humankind and be relevant for the wider global community?
2. Where the narrative might be partial, might reflect 'new truths' or might reflect political ideas, how might the value of their memories be defined as a universal?
3. As the World Heritage Convention is a place or site based convention, to what degree must sites of conflict reflect their memory or memories? Could sites be inscribed as memorials if they were otherwise unrelated to the events and might not be seen as outstanding in any other way?
4. As conflicts are the result of particular circumstances at a particular time, when might they be considered to reflect a period in history? How might any relatively major conflict which has impacted strongly on a particular society be excluded?
5. If one or more sites associated with memories of a recent conflict are considered outstanding, would these sites symbolise the whole conflict or could different sites reflect different memories? For conflicts such as World Wars I and II that might be considered to have global significance, do the memories of all nations involved in those conflicts need to be reflected? How might each of the many thousands of sites that reflect those conflicts be evaluated as key parts of the whole? How might selections be made?
6. Who should be consulted as stakeholders in relation to those involved in different sides of the conflict?
7. If a site is of value for the memory of a particular conflict, should the site reflect its appearances at the time of the conflict or what degree of change might be considered appropriate?
8. As it is now widely acknowledged that memorialisation is part of wider post-conflict reconciliation processes that are both dynamic and evolving, could fixing memories in relation to Outstanding Universal Value be unhelpful?

The questions could be multiplied: but even for those listed, it is suggested that an adequate framework is not in place to address the ramifications that are implied. And there is also concern that if one or two sites get inscribed for memories of recent conflicts for which there is less than a clear understanding of how their value might be universal, and with a lack of precision as to what the places convey or whose memory is being recognised, it might become difficult to forestall many other similar sites being nominated.

8. Conclusions and Recommendations

The recent inclusion on Tentative Lists of many sites associated with memories of recent conflicts together with the nominations now being submitted highlight sensitivities that have already been acknowledged by the World Heritage Committee in 1979, 1991 and 1996. These relate in particular to commonality and neutrality; how can the idea of World Heritage properties being of relevance to the whole of humanity be satisfied in relation to sites associated with memories of recent conflicts? And how might partiality be avoided as sites associated with recent conflicts are nearly always partisan in one way or another or strongly influenced by national or political ideas – something that was seen in 1979 as being 'in contradiction with the objectives of the World Heritage Convention'. And should memories of such recent conflicts be fixed when memorialisation is now an accepted part of wider dynamic post-conflict processes?

Given the complexities and sensitivities raised by these current and proposed nominations, and the questions they raise in relation to the purpose and scope of the Convention, it is suggested that a period of reflection could be beneficial.

The World Heritage Committee might wish to consider convening an Expert Meeting (or a series of meetings) on sites associated with memories of recent conflicts to allow for both philosophical and practical reflections on the nature of memorialization, the value of evolving memories, the inter-relationship between material and immaterial attributes in relation to memory, how meaningful comparisons of tragedy and loss might be undertaken, and the issue of stakeholder consultation, as a prelude to the development of guidance on whether and how sites associated with memories of recent conflicts might relate to the purpose and scope of the World Heritage Convention, and perhaps more widely to an understanding as to whether World Heritage inscription that fixes OUV at the time of inscription might sit uncomfortably with the wider complex and shifting dynamics of post-conflict reconciliation processes.

It is noted that there is a precedent for this approach in the way the World Heritage Committee developed guidance for cultural landscapes following the difficulties faced by in the evaluation of the first two nominations of the Lake District, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, in 1986 and 1989.

April 2018

ANNEXES

Details of Inscribed, Nominated, and Tentative List sites associated with memories of recent conflicts

Summary chart

Status	State Party	Site name
Inscribed Properties	Japan	Hiroshima Peace Memorial (Genbaku Dome)
	Marshall Islands	Bikini Atoll Nuclear Test Site
	Poland	Auschwitz Birkenau
Tentative Lists' Properties	Angola	Cuito Cuanavale, Site de Libération et Indépendance
	Argentina	ESMA Site Museum - Former Clandestine Centre of Detention, Torture, and Extermination
	Cabo verde	Camp de concentration du Tarrafal
	Belgium / France	Sites funéraires et mémoriels de la Première Guerre mondiale (Front Ouest)
	France	Les Plages du Débarquement, Normandie, 1944
	India	Cellular Jail, Andaman Islands
	Russian Federation	Mamayev Kurgan Memorial Complex "To the Heroes of the Battle of Stalingrad"
	Rwanda	Sites mémoriaux du génocide : Nyamata, Murambi, Bisesero et Gisozi
	Slovenia	The Walk of Peace from the Alps to the Adriatic – Heritage of the First World War
	Turkey	Çanakkale (Dardanelles) and Gelibolu (Gallipoli) Battles Zones in the First World War

Inscribed Properties

ID #	775
Name of property	Hiroshima Peace Memorial (Genbaku Dome)
State Party	Japan
Status, date, session	Inscribed, 1996, 20COM
Decision criteria	(vi)
Decisions of the Committee	Inscribed
Advisory body Committee recommendation	That this property be inscribed on the World Heritage List, exceptionally, on the basis of criterion (vi) alone: The Hiroshima Peace Memorial. Genbaku Dome, is a stark and powerful symbol of the achievement of world peace for more than half a century following the unleashing of the most destructive force ever created by humankind.
Brief description	The Hiroshima Peace Memorial (Genbaku Dome) was the only structure left standing in the area where the first atomic bomb exploded on 6 August 1945. Through the efforts of many people, including those of the city of Hiroshima, it has been preserved in the same state as immediately after the bombing. Not only is it a stark and powerful symbol of the most destructive force ever created by humankind; it also expresses the hope for world peace and the ultimate elimination of all nuclear weapons.

ID #	1339
Name of property	Bikini Atoll Nuclear Test Site
State Party	Marshall Islands
Status, date, session	Inscribed, 2010, 34COM
Decision criteria	(iv)(vi)
Decisions of the Committee	The World Heritage Committee, 1. Having examined Documents WHC-10/34.COM/8B and WHC-10/34.COM/INF.8B1, 2. Inscribes the Bikini Atoll Nuclear Test Site , Marshall Islands on the World Heritage List on the basis of criteria (iv) and (vi) ;
Advisory body Committee recommendation	ICOMOS recommends that the nomination of Bikini Atoll, nuclear tests site, Republic of the Marshall Islands, be referred back to the State Party to allow it to: Draw up an inventory of the land-based properties that contribute to the value of the property; inscribe the most important of these on the national historic sites list; monitor their conservation, specifying the frequency for monitoring to be carried out and the organization that will take charge of monitoring.

ID #	31
Name of property	Auschwitz Birkenau
State Party	Poland
Status, date, session	Inscribed, 1979, 3COM
Decision criteria	(vi)
Decisions of the Committee	Inscribed
Advisory body Committee recommendation	Inscribed
Brief description	The fortified walls, barbed wire, platforms, barracks, gallows, gas chambers and cremation ovens show the conditions within which the Nazi genocide took place in the former concentration and extermination camp of Auschwitz-Birkenau, the largest in the Third Reich. According to historical investigations, 1.5 million people, among them a great number of Jews, were systematically starved, tortured and murdered in this camp, the symbol of humanity's cruelty to its fellow human beings in the 20th century.

Tentative Lists' Properties

ID #	6252
Name of property	Cuito Cuanavale, Site de Libération et Indépendance
State Party	Angola
Date of submission	2017
Recommended criteria	(iii)(vi)
Brief description	<p>Cuito Cuanavale est l'une des plus importantes municipalités de la province de Kuando Kubango et est située à seulement 400 km de la frontière avec la Namibe. Cuito Cuanavale est entrée dans les annales de l'histoire glorieuse du peuple angolais comme le berceau de l'une des batailles militaires les plus violentes sous toutes les latitudes du continent africain au cours de la dernière moitié du XXe siècle.</p> <p>Cuito Cuanavale a accueilli et consacré les plus brillantes expressions contemporaines de solidarité internationale pour la défense de la patrie et de renouvellement, a donné son nom à la bataille qui a balayé le mythe de l'invincibilité de l'armée raciste sud-africaine et a ouvert une nouvelle ère dans l'histoire des peuple de l'Afrique du sud ouest.</p> <p>Justification of Outstanding Universal Value</p> <p>Ce fut le résultat triomphant atteint par les combattants angolais et internationalistes cubains dans la bataille de Cuito Cuanavale, que le régime raciste et expansionniste de l'Afrique du Sud a été convaincu de l'impossibilité et de l'incapacité d'imposer sa volonté au peuple souverain de l'Angola, même par la force des armes de continuer à maintenir la situation intenable de conflit dans le sud ouest de l'Afrique et son incapacité indéniable de continuer à imposer une politique de guerre et de la terre brûlée aux États de la région Australe.</p> <p>La manœuvre militaire réussie opérée par les combattants FAPLA, avec le soutien solidaire des combattants cubains, à partir de Cuito Cuanavale et continue avec la même détermination en Tchipa, Calueque et Ruacaná, a pris le régime raciste d'accepter la proposition politique négociable avec la seule voie en mesure de mener à une solution rationnelle du grand conflit en Afrique du Sud.</p> <p>Ce succès du combat armé lié à d'autres succès de la lutte politique et diplomatique, a permis après de nombreuses années de guerre, morts, mutilations, que la paix pouvait sourire pour le peuple angolais, que la liberté et l'indépendance pour le peuple namibien martyrisé a atteint le seuil de sa caractérisation que l'ère de coopération et de coexistence pouvait initier au niveau de l'Afrique australe.</p> <p>Alors, Cuito Cuanaval a marqué avec tout mérite le point culminant de la guerre d'agression non élaborée, imposé au peuple de l'Angola par le raciste de l'Afrique du Sud.</p> <p>Critère (iii) : Cuito Cuanavale est un espace qui a accueilli et consacré les plus brillantes expressions contemporaines de solidarité internationale pour la défense de la patrie et de renouvellement, a donné son nom à la bataille qui a balayé le mythe de l'invincibilité de l'armée raciste sud-africaine et a ouvert une nouvelle ère dans l'histoire des peuple de l'Afrique du sud ouest.</p> <p>Critère (vi) : Le site de Cuito Cuanavale est un site de memoire de la guerre contre l'ancien regime de l'apartheid, Sud africain, qui a duré de Novembre 1987 à Mars 1988.</p> <p>Donc, reconnaitre ce site comme un site de memoire de l'humanité est une stratégie efficace pour la lutte contre l'inégalité perpétrée par l'apartheid, mais surtout reconnaitre que, la paix pouvait sourire pour les peuples, que la liberté et l'indépendance est possible pour les peuples réprimés et martyrisés tels que les namibiens peut atteint la seuil de sa caractérisation que l'ère de coopération et de coexistence est possible en Afrique.</p> <p>Statements of authenticity and/or integrity</p> <p>Un monument en mémoire de la bataille de Cuito Cuanaval a été construit, dont la fonction et l'usage sont devenus ceux des sites historiques.</p> <p>L'ensemble des preuves tangibles de la guerre sont conservées sur place pour témoigner de l'histoire collective des deux peuples angolais et namibien. De façon globale, ce site et les collections de matériel de guerre témoignent de l'authenticité et de l'intégrité du site préservé dans son état originel. Leurs fonctions initiales d'un lieu de mémoire collective de l'humanité, un lieu éducatif, un lieu de recueillement en mémoire des victimes, un lieu d'exposition de preuves matérielles et immatérielles d'une guerre que a duré environ un an, restent inchangées.</p> <p>Comparison with other similar properties</p> <p>Comparés à Auschwitz Birkenau, les sites mémoriaux Cuito Cuanaval conservent encore les restes de materiel beliqueux angolais et du regime Sud Africain de d'époque, et autres témoignages utilisés pendant la guerre.</p>

ID #	6248
Name of property	ESMA Site Museum - Former Clandestine Centre of Detention, Torture, and Extermination
State Party	Argentina
Date of submission	2017
Recommended criteria	(iii)(vi)
Brief description	<p>The current ESMA Site Museum building, with a surface area of 5,390 sq. m. and located on the 16-hectare property where the Navy School of Mechanics used to be, was inaugurated in 1946 as the Officers' Mess. The bedrooms of the highest-ranking officers in the Argentine Navy were in this building—an isolated pavilion rounded by gardens composed by a main building with three subordinated perpendicular blocks, with basements and a large attic.</p> <p>Between 1976 and 1983, during the last military dictatorship, ESMA premises was a fundamental part of the repressive scheme whose epicentre was in this building, where the Clandestine Centre of Detention, Torture, and Extermination (CCDTyE) operated. Here, the Navy kidnapped, tortured and disappeared more than 5,000 men and women. The serious human rights violations, the systematic plan to steal children born in captivity, and the extermination of prisoners who were thrown alive into the sea during the so-called "flights of death" make this building a symbol of the genocide that took place in our country. It is incontrovertible proof of the State terrorism that inflicted extreme criminal violence on society at large.</p>

ID #	6102
Name of property	Camp de concentration du Tarrafal
State Party	Cabo Verde
Date of submission	2016
Recommended criteria	(iii)(vi)
Brief description	<p>Le Camp de Concentration de Tarrafal est ancré dans les esprits des Portugais, Angolais, Guinéens et Cap-Verdiens comme le « camp de la mort lente » ou de « mort ». Pendant plus de trente ans de fonctionnement il a servi à pratiquer les crimes les plus odieux, laissant des cicatrices physiques et psychologiques irréversibles chez ceux qui se sont audacieusement opposés à l'ordre politique et social existant du Nouvel État (dictature portugaise). Celle-ci était la solution mutatis mutandis prônée par le régime de Salazar tout comme d'autres régimes totalitaires qui ont émergé en Europe dans la première moitié du XXe siècle.</p> <p>Érigé par le décret n°26, 539 du 23 avril 1936, la colonie pénale de Tarrafal a reçu ses 152 premiers prisonniers le 29 octobre de cette année. Le camp a fonctionné jusqu'en 1956. Dans cette première phase, il a servi pour recevoir les antifascistes portugais, parmi eux, Bento Goncalves et Mario Castelhana dirigeants de la PCP et de la CGT, qui sont décédés au camp.</p> <p>Après plusieurs années de fermeture, il rouvre ses portes en 1962, sous le nom de camp de travail de Chão Bom et sera cette fois-ci, destiné à incarcérer les anticolonialistes de l'Angola, de la Guinée Bissau et du Cabo Verde. Au total, plus de 500 personnes détenues, dont 340 antifascistes et 230 anticolonialistes ont été détenus.</p> <p>Localisé à Chão Bom, en bordure de la ville de Tarrafal (Mangue), dans une région inhabitable et isolée, le camp était une solution pragmatique du régime de Salazar, empêchant de cette façon les prisonniers de communiquer avec l'extérieur, ce qui compliquait toute tentative d'évasion en provoquant aux déportés un effet décourageant.</p> <p>Parallèlement à cela, le choix de Tarrafal de Santiago prétendait créer une certaine confusion dans les familles et proches des prisonniers. En effet, la première expérience de déportation massive des prisonniers politiques, a commencé en 1931 au Camp de Concentration de Tarrafal de l'île de São Nicolau. Ces deux localités homonymes situées dans deux îles différentes, limitaient l'accès aux informations relatives aux prisonniers et fonctionnait comme un moyen de dissuader les membres de la famille de chercher les prisonniers.</p> <p>Pour l'exécution de ce projet, l'Etat Nouveau a eu l'aide de la police politique (PIDE). Cette police, inspiré par son homologue allemand (Gestapo), fonctionnait comme un mécanisme de censure et de répression et était conçu pour assurer l'intégrité du régime.</p> <p>Le complexe pénitentiaire de Tarrafal se composait de plusieurs bâtiments, beaucoup d'entre eux construits en utilisant le travail forcé des premiers</p>

prisonniers. Ainsi, dans le complexe pénitentiaire, on trouve des bâtiments tels que des casernes pour les soldats, une buanderie, une centrale électrique, un bureau du secrétariat, des entrepôts, une cuisine, un réfectoire, une chapelle et la résidence pour les chefs et la police.

Le camp de concentration possède un plan rectangulaire entouré de murs de béton, ce qui reflète le système de défense des forteresses médiévales caractérisé par sa grandeur et son inviolabilité.

Les conditions de vie dans le camp de concentration étaient dures et déplorables. Les abus, l'isolement et l'humiliation auxquels les prisonniers étaient soumis ont conduit beaucoup d'entre eux à la mort ou ont laissé des conséquences psychologiques et physiques. Mise à part le travail forcé, la torture était fréquemment pratiquée comme la frigideira (petite cellule de 9m2 en ciment sans fenêtres et toit et exposée au soleil qui pouvait contenir jusqu'à 17 prisonniers en même temps), la statue, la torture de sommeil ou les coups, constituent des exemples des pratiques inhumaines infligés aux prisonniers. De plus, la mauvaise alimentation et l'eau insalubre, souvent contaminée, ont contribué à aggraver la situation précaire des prisonniers. Les prisonniers ont souffert des maladies, étant le paludisme, la biliose, la tuberculose et les infections intestinales les affections les plus courantes. Les soins médicaux étaient pratiquement de nature criminelle restant gravé dans la mémoire des prisonniers le docteur Esmeraldo Pais da Prata, qui lors de son arrivé au camp a prononcé les mots suivants: Je ne suis pas ici pour guérir, mais pour certifier les décès. Au total, trente-six Portugais sont morts dans la première phase de fonctionnement du camp et au moins deux Guinéens ont subi le même dans la phase suivante.

Dans le camp, les prisonniers ne pouvaient pas lire des journaux ou des livres jugés dangereux ou subversifs, leurs correspondances étaient censurées et les autorités évitaient tout le contact entre les prisonniers de différentes nationalités. Ceci était utilisé comme un moyen de limiter la liberté tout en maintenant les détenus déconnectés de la réalité et de ce qui se passait en dehors de la prison.

Le camp de concentration, malgré sa durabilité relative, a seulement ouvert ses portes pour libérer les prisonniers le 1er mai 1974, suite à la Révolution des Œillets du 25 Avril de cette année. Dans ce sens, le camp de concentration de Tarrafal représente un symbole de la résistance contre les politiques du régime de Salazar et évoque un site de mémoire douloureux qui témoigne du prix de la liberté.

En résumé, le but de cet camp, conçu à l'origine pour réprimer, censurer, torturer, castrer, et faire taire les opposants du régime, n'a pas eu l'effet envisagé, par la volonté de liberté, la dignité, l'autodétermination, la rationalité, et, finalement, l'humanisme transcendant l'irrationalité rappellent ce que le poète Corsino Fortes a écrit « les cloches du silence résonnent dans le creux de la coupole des souvenirs qui rêvent. »

ID #	5884
Name of property	Sites funéraires et mémoriels de la Première Guerre mondiale (Front Ouest)
State Party	Belgium/France
Date of submission	2014
Recommended criteria	(iii)(iv)(vi)
Brief description	<p>Le bien en série regroupe un ensemble significatif de sites funéraires et mémoriels résultant de la Première Guerre mondiale, rupture majeure dans l'histoire de l'humanité. Ils ont été constitués pendant ou après la tragédie de 1914-1918, sur la zone du front ouest qui s'étendait de la mer du Nord à la frontière franco-suisse. La sélection est constituée de 105 éléments (80 pour la France et 25 pour la Belgique) strictement choisis au sein d'un ensemble de plusieurs milliers de cimetières, nécropoles et mémoriaux du front ouest.</p> <p>Ces éléments sont représentatifs de la très grande diversité des nations et des peuples qui ont été impliqués dans ce conflit mondial, d'une ampleur jamais encore atteinte. Ils composent un paysage mémoriel représentatif de l'étendue géographique du front dans son ensemble (plus de 700 km), des grands moments de son histoire et de ses évolutions au cours de la guerre.</p>

ID #	5883
Name of property State Party	Les Plages du Débarquement, Normandie, 1944 France
Date of submission	2014
Recommended criteria	(iv)(vi)
Brief description	<p>Les Plages du Débarquement regroupent l'ensemble des plages sur lesquelles eurent lieu les opérations de débarquement du 6 juin 1944 : Utah Beach, Omaha Beach, Gold Beach, Juno Beach et Sword Beach.</p> <p>Celles-ci sont complétées par des éléments terrestres et maritimes côtiers, dont le rôle fut majeur lors de cet affrontement : la Pointe du Hoc, la batterie de Longues-sur-Mer et le port artificiel Winston Churchill, ainsi que par un champ subaquatique au large des plages.</p> <p>Les Plages du Débarquement comprennent ainsi neuf éléments complémentaires les uns des autres qui illustrent les dimensions paysagères, matérielles, historiques et culturelles associées au Débarquement de Normandie, plus particulièrement :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - l'aménagement défensif réalisé sous le nom de « Mur de l'Atlantique » par les forces armées du III^e Reich et l'Organisation Todt s'appuyant sur la géomorphologie du littoral ; - les aménagements logistiques des Alliés comprenant deux ports artificiels et des traces laissées dans le paysage des plages ; - les nombreux vestiges subaquatiques illustrant l'effort logistique et naval des Alliés ; - les constructions mémorielles à proximité immédiate des plages qui ont fait suite au Débarquement (cimetières, monuments mémoriaux, etc...). <p>Le bien proposé constitue une succession diversifiée de paysages culturels reliques évolutifs, au sens du témoignage laissé par l'événement du Débarquement, témoignage par la suite soumis à l'interaction de la nature et des hommes.</p> <p>Il témoigne particulièrement :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - des traces de la bataille sur les éléments défensifs, sur la destruction du bâti civil et sur la topographie des lieux (percées dans les cordons dunaires, création de routes, modifications dans la composition physico-chimique du sable des plages...); - des changements ultérieurs (recul du trait de côte...); - du paysage maritime et côtier unique créé par le port artificiel Winston Churchill ; - du champ archéologique subaquatique, que les nouvelles techniques d'imagerie numérique et de relevé des fonds marins permettent de bien appréhender.

ID #	5888
Name of property State Party	Cellular Jail, Andaman Islands India
Date of submission	2014
Recommended criteria	(iv)(vi)
Brief description	<p>Cellular Jail is situated on South Andaman Island, one of 572 islands forming Union Territory of Andaman and Nicobar Islands in India. Inhabited since 2000 years, the islands were occupied by Europeans in the middle of 18th century. Few years later, British established naval base and a penal settlement on Chatham Island which was later shifted Viper Island.</p> <p>The idea of establishing a permanent penal settlement in these islands was germinated in the minds of the British Rulers in 1857 to curb India's First War of Independence. A Committee of experts visited the islands for a survey in December 1857 and submitted a report to the Government in January 1858. The first batch of 200 convicts arrived on the island on 10th March 1858 under the overall charge of Dr. J. P. Walker.</p> <p>Though the First War of Independence was quelled, the flame for achieving freedom could not be suppressed. Soon, freedom fighters taking part in various movements including Wahabi Movement, Manipuri Revolt, and a large number of Burmese from Tharawadda against British rule were also deported to the penal punishment in the Andaman. The prisoners were initially kept in the open enclosures.</p> <p>As the time passed and the settlement grew in size, the authorities found it difficult to enforce strict discipline. A high security jail that could hold a large number in</p>

solitary confinement became necessary. A two-member committee headed by Sir Charles J. Lyall and Sir, A. S. Lethbridge visited Port Blair in 1890 and recommended the construction of penal facility near Port Blair. The construction of Cellular Jail building started in 1893 by the settlement order No.423 dated 13th September 1893. It was completed in 1905-06 using prisoners only as construction labour.

Cellular Jail is a massive three-storeyed structure with seven wings of unequal lengths, radiating from a central watch tower, shaped like spokes of a wheel. The architecture of Cellular Jail was conceptualized on the basis of 'Pennsylvania System or Separate System' theory in which separate confinement is necessary for each inmate for complete isolation from other inmates. No communication of any kind was possible between prisoners in the same or different wings. The design of Cellular Jail is heavily influenced by 'Panopticon' theory where radiating wings allowed a single guard to keep watch on all the prisoners from the central tower but without the prisoner being able to see him. Prisoners deported to Cellular Jail for long term imprisonment for opposing British rule in India included eminent political convicts; revolutionaries. Therefore, the Cellular Jail was designed to check exchange of ideas and to enhance the penal character of the settlement so that it could be considered as next to capital punishment.

The construction was carried out by the prisoners deported from the main land. Building material was brought in from Burma. The accommodation for the officers including Jailor and Assistant Jailors was provided within the building. The individual cells in the Jail are placed in one row along the 4' wide verandah running the whole length of every wing. Each cell measures 13 1/2' x 7', secured by a heavy iron grill door with specially designed latch system. Confinement in the small cells gave this facility its name 'Cellular Jail'. About 20,000 cubic feet of local stone and 30,00,000 bricks made by prisoners were used to construct the jail. The infrastructure for hard labour such as Iron grills, chains, fetters, shackles, flogging stands, and oil mills was brought from England.

Other than isolation, the work quotas given to these prisoners were frequently impossible to complete within the time and the dire punishment followed for those who failed to meet them. Often punishment was inhuman. Torture and flogging were frequently resorted to on iron triangular frame, bar fetters, crossbar fetters and neck ring shackle, leg iron chains and gunny bag uniforms, unhygienic diet were other deterrents for those who refused to submit to the brutal wardens. No cells in the Cellular Jail had toilet facilities. The punishment varied from handcuffs for a week and fetters for six months to solitary confinement. Remoteness and terror of the facility gave it a name, 'Kala Pani' (Black waters).

Distressed prisoners in Cellular Jail frequently rebelled against the tyranny of the jail officials. Mass hunger strikes were resorted to especially between 1932 and 1937. The last strike began in July 1937 continued for 45 day. The strike was terminated only on the intervention of Mahatma Gandhi and Rabindra Nath Tagore. The Government decided to close down the penal settlement and all the political prisoners of Cellular Jail were repatriated to their respective states on mainland India by January 1938.

The Japanese occupied the Andaman and Nicobar Islands during World War II from 1942 to 1945. Netaji Subhash Chandra Bose visited Cellular Jail as Head of the Provisional Government of India on 29th December 1943. He called it, Indian Bastille.

The four out of original seven wings of the Jail had to be demolished after the damage during the earthquake in 1941. After Independence in 1947, many of the erstwhile political prisoners visited the islands. Their association - "Ex-Andaman Political Prisoner's Fraternity Circle" put up a proposal to preserve remaining three wings. Then, Cellular Jail was declared a National Memorial by the then Prime Minister of India on 11th February 1979.

ID #	5936
Name of property	Mamayev Kurgan Memorial Complex "To the Heroes of the Battle of Stalingrad"
State Party	Russian Federation
Date of submission	2014
Recommended criteria	(i)(iv)(vi)
Brief description	Description Mamayev Kurgan Memorial complex "To the heroes of the Battle of Stalingrad" in Volgograd is a symbol of heroism and patriotism of the Soviet nation and a tribute to the memory of those who died in the great battle of the Volga river, the most significant land battle in the human history which became a turning point in the

World War II.

Due to its convenient location in the very centre of the city, Mamayev Kurgan held the key position in the defence of Stalingrad, and it is here where the construction of an enormous memorial complex started in the May of 1959, it being first presented on 15th October, 1967.

The Memorial complex "To the heroes of the Battle of Stalingrad" represents a unique formation with a total height of 820 meters from its foot to the top.

There is a flight of steps, ramps and squares with sculptural compositions leading to the top of the ensemble which tell us about the Battle of Stalingrad, ending with the Military Honour Hall, the Square of Sorrow and the war cemetery dedicated to the fallen.

The key element of the ensemble is a world famous sculpture "The Motherland Calls!", one of the most recognizable and artistic war monuments.

The main elements and components of the memorial complex:

Entry Square with an introductory composition "Memory of Generations"

The composition represents a huge high relief (17 m x 3 m x 0,75 m) consisting of 11 figures. A funeral procession goes towards Mamayev Kurgan to pay tribute to those who died.

Avenue of Lombardy Poplars

"Fight to the bitter!" Square with "Fight to the bitter!" Sculpture - the sculptural image of a soldier as if growing together with the land out of the great Russian river Volga personifying heroic defenders of the Volgian strength.

Symbolic Walls - the ruins of Stalingrad : The ruins of a huge building destroyed by long term shooting attacks, endless bombings, direct hits and bursts of fire.

Square of Heroes which comprises the wall as a spread banner saying: "With an iron wind blowing straight into their faces, they were still marching forward, and fear seized the enemy: were they people who were attacking? were they mortal at all?!" and six sculptural groups as if answering this question: The all of us were ordinary mortals". The first of the groups is inscribed: "We've stood out and defeated death!" The second one is dedicated to nurses. The third group is devoted to sea soldiers. The fourth of the groups commemorates the commanders of the Battle of Stalingrad. The fifth tells the story of saving the banner. The sixth group represents the victory at Stalingrad and the end of the great battle.

Monumental Relief exhibiting main episodes of the great battle: the attack of Soviet troops at Stalingrad, blockading of the fascists and their destruction, the victorious movement of Russian forces to the west, the selfless labour of workers of the fronts. Big Breast Wall which bears the monumental relief

Military Honour Hall

Square of Sorrow with the composition "Mother's sorrow".

Other stones are symbolic.

The first of the memorial stones was founded to the honour of an Unknown soldier with the inscription on it: "Your name is unknown. Your deed is immortal. Eternal glory".

The key monument "The Motherland Calls!"

The central element of the complex "The Motherland Calls!" is an allegorical statue of Motherland. It is the heart of the whole memorial.

Little collective grave

Those who had died defending the main height of Russia - Mamayev Kurgan - are buried here.

Tank Turret on the plinth defines the place of the most violent fights during the Battle of Stalingrad.

Church of all the Saints

Military Memorial Cemetery of the Soviet soldiers fallen during the Battle of Stalingrad between 1942 and 1943 (west slope of Mamayev Kurgan). It consists of the Memorial Walls bearing 6480 surnames of warriors died in the Battle of Stalingrad.

Individual Reburials - here the gravestones are set bearing full names, dates of birth and death. Collective Graves - here unknown soldiers have been reburied.

ID #	5753
Name of property	Sites mémoriaux du génocide : Nyamata, Murambi, Bisesero et Gisozi
State Party	Rwanda
Date of submission	2012
Recommended criteria	(iii)(vi)
Brief description	<p>Situés respectivement à 35 km, 154 km, 161 km et 3 km du centre ville de Kigali, Nyamata, Murambi, Bisesero et Gisozi dans leur ensemble sont des sites mémoriaux du génocide perpétré contre les tutsi entre avril et Juillet 1994 au Rwanda. Ces sites couvrent une superficie totale de 30.869 hectares.</p> <p>Outre les bâtiments dans lesquels sont exposés quelques restes de victimes et autres preuves matérielles du génocide : lances, machettes, gourdins, armes blanches et photos de certaines victimes, les sites regorgent également plusieurs tombes dans lesquelles sont inhumés dignement les corps de victimes tuées sur place et aux environs.</p> <p>Devenus parties intégrantes des sites mémoriaux, ces édifices avaient initialement d'autres fonctions, à part Bisesero et Gisozi construits pour cette fin.</p> <p>Nyamata : autrefois église catholique construite en 1980, cet édifice a été réduit en abattoir où plus de quarante cinq milles personnes qui y avaient cherché refuge ont toutes été massacrées pendant un jour. Après négociations, l'église catholique et le gouvernement rwandais l'ont transformé en mémorial représentatif d'autres églises dans lesquelles sont mortes les victimes du génocide perpétré contre les Tutsi. Le site est composé notamment de la chapelle proprement dite dans laquelle sont exposés les habits que portaient les victimes, les outils utilisés par les génocidaires: machettes, lances, couteaux ainsi que les chapelets que portaient les innocents fidèles de ladite chapelle.</p> <p>Étant donné qu'un grand nombre de victimes fut massacré à l'intérieur de l'église, son auditorium est une exposition d'outils divers et sa cave est transformée en une grande exposition de restes humains conservés dans des vitres.</p> <p>Dans les enceintes de l'église on y observe :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - deux tombes communes et une cave d'exposition des restes humains, en souvenir des personnes torturées et tuées à l'extérieur de la chapelle ; - deux pierres tombales sur lesquelles sont transcrits quelques noms de victimes qui y sont inhumées; - la tombe de Tonia LOCATELLI, une fille italienne venue au Rwanda avec des volontaires laïcs rattachés aux sœurs hospitalières suisses de sainte Marthe, en 1970, elle s'était illustrée dans les œuvres caritatives à Nyamata. Elle a été tuée le 09 mars 1992 lorsqu'elle tentait de sauver les tutsi qui avaient cherché refuge chez elle, lors de massacres survenus dans cette région de l'Est du pays. En 2010, cette religieuse a été honorée d'une médaille par le Président de la République lors de la journée nationale de libération célébrée tous les quatre juillet de chaque année. Sa tombe qui est dans les enceintes du site existe avant avril 1994. <p>Murambi : construit en 1990 pour devenir un complexe scolaire technique, Murambi était devenu un lieu de persécution où entre 45 et 50 milles personnes habitant la colline et ses environs, toutes appelées et sensibilisées par les autorités locales et les ex-forces armées rwandaises à s'y regrouper sous prétexte de garantir leur sécurité, furent effroyablement massacrées.</p> <p>Devenu un mémorial, ce complexe de douze locaux de six portes chacun auxquels s'ajoutent leurs annexes sont tous devenus des lieux d'exposition de restes humains et d'objets utilisés par les génocidaires ainsi que quelques éléments d'identification des victimes. Les huit tombes dans lesquelles sont dignement inhumées les victimes de Murambi font parties intégrantes du site.</p> <p>C'est également sur cette colline de Murambi qu'était basé l'état major de l'armée française intervenue au Rwanda en 1994 dans ce qu'on avait appelé l'Opération Turquoise.</p> <p>Bisesero : appelé aussi mémorial de résistance, Bisesero fut construit en 1998 pour conserver l'histoire générale du génocide des Tutsi de la région, la résistance et le refus aux massacres commis contre eux. Outre l'histoire expliquée à travers la position de la colline, c'est-à-dire, de bas où vivaient les victimes vers le sommet où elles s'étaient enfuies, le site est une colline de 32% de déclivité couvertes d'une forêt à ses abords sur laquelle est construits trois maisons à trois chambres chacune soit un total de neuf chambres, symbole de neuf anciennes communes de la Préfecture de Kibuye. Ces maisons qui servent d'exposition de preuves du génocide sont liées l'une à l'autre par un total d'escaliers de 285.71 mètres de longueur jusqu'à la déclinaison de la colline où se trouvent les sept tombes dans lesquelles sont inhumées près de cinquante milles victimes du génocide commis contre les Tutsi en 1994.</p>

Ces escaliers qui se resserrent au fur et à mesure que l'on monte la colline font référence aux milliers de personnes qui ont mené la résistance contre les tueries mais ne tinrent pas aux forces du génocide à cause de l'épuisement, de la souffrance et surtout de manque de moyens d'auto défense vis-à-vis aux génocidaires minutieusement formés et armés.

L'entassement de milliers de pierres au bas de la colline autour desquelles sont enfoncées neuf lances, principales armes traditionnelles avec lesquelles se défendaient les victimes se font remarquer tout juste à l'entrée du site et tous font parties intégrantes du site et de son histoire.

Gisozi : ce complexe mémorial construit en 1999 est le plus grand site du pays quant à la taille de victimes qui y sont inhumées: trois cent milles victimes retrouvées jonchées dans les rues de Kigali et ses abords, abandonnées dans leurs maisons, jetées morts ou vivants dans des fosses communes, jetées dans des rivières et rejetées sur les rives de celles-ci par les eaux une fois morts.

Ce complexe mémorial contient une grande exposition permanente qui trace l'histoire générale du Rwanda, depuis sa formation au 11ème siècle jusqu'à sa sombre période de l'extermination d'une partie de sa population, les Tutsi, en 1994. Une partie de l'exposition décrit les témoignages de la planification et l'exécution du génocide, ses tristes conséquences ainsi que le processus de l'unité et la réconciliation nationale entre ses filles et fils. Les objets individuels de victimes ainsi que différentes types d'armes utilisées y sont également exposés.

Outre l'histoire du génocide rwandais qui est décrite depuis sa planification et sa systématique exécution, on y retrouve aussi une exposition comparative des génocides : arménien, juif, cambodgien et serbe.

A côté de quelques 14 tombes communes dans lesquelles sont ensevelies les 300 000 personnes, un grand mur de mémoire sur lequel 2000 noms signalés par les rescapés et leurs voisins y sont transcrits. La liste reste cependant ouverte pour l'identification d'autres victimes.

Ce complexe mémorial de Gisozi a pour composante également, un centre de documentation sur le génocide au profit des chercheurs locaux et internationaux, un jardin de mémoire et un musée café.

ID #	6077
Name of property	The Walk of Peace from the Alps to the Adriatic – Heritage of the First World War
State Party	Slovenia
Date of submission	2016
Recommended criteria	(ii) (vi)
Brief description	<p>The Walk of Peace is a particular route of peace and commemoration and a genuine memorial landscape in a unique dialogue with protected natural environment, of which it has become an integral part. It represents an outstanding cultural and social environment and narrate the (hi)stories of the past hundred years, respecting the individual, intimate as well as collective experience. It creates a new transnational identity with respect to every singularity of its components. The international character of the conflict has turned into the transnational nature of the Walk of Peace.</p> <p>Some sites have already been declared monuments of national importance, all are entered in the National Heritage Registry,. The military cemeteries are protected by the War Grave Sites Act. Several institutions on the state, regional and local levels take care of maintaining the material remains on the sites and make them talk to a visitor. The Kobarid Museum and the "Walks of Peace in the Soča Region Foundation" take care of preserving the historical heritage of the Isonzo Front and presenting it for study-, tourist- and educational purposes.</p> <p>The Walk of Peace constitutes a historical and remembrance route that connects cultural heritage on the sites of the First World War from the Alps to the Adriatic. The component parts are chosen with a clear vision to express through different aspects connected to the physical heritage a unified, common and unique narrative of war and peace.</p> <p>Criterion (ii): The material heritage of the Walk of Peace is still nowadays the tangible witness of human aspiration to find humanity in the most brutal conditions of the war, when an unprecedented scale of destruction and violence also triggered an enormous scale of human effort to worship and commemorate the dead comrades and to pave the way for a peaceful future.</p> <p>From the strategic point of view the front line, which is a route of peace and mutual respect today, represents a unique military exertion in the mountain warfare and on the harsh karst terrain. The material imprints of the First World War (trenches, shelters, remains of buildings, etc.) are still present everywhere and, thanks to the conservation and preservation processes, have become an integral part of the</p>

landscape in the region both in physical and spiritual sense.

The wooden Russian Orthodox chapel on the steep slope in the Alps, or the picturesque, yet heart-breaking Memorial Church of the Holy Spirit at Javorca plateau, reflect the survivors' inner urge to construct timeless memorials to their dead comrades. The two shrines preserved the tradition in style and materials, each of its original space and society.

More than 45 well preserved and regularly maintained military cemeteries in the Isonzo valley are part of the funerary tradition of the First World War. They contain individual tombs, mainly with crosses as headstones, on which soldiers' names, when known, are inscribed. A new manner of worshipping the dead emerged during the First World War when soldiers expressed their wish to make a closure with the dead companions and with the war itself.

The cultural heritage is represented by charnel houses, memorial plaques, cemeteries and caves which are material witnesses of war technology and architecture as well as of different religious traditions. They have survived the traumatic century of wars, displacements, destructions and political changes, and have been well preserved until today and also respected by the state authorities, civil societies and local population and administration.

The Walk of Peace stretches across three national- and natural zones, thus bridging different cultures, identities, and traditions. The memorial landscape of the Walk of Peace marks the turbulent past that turned into a good practice of effective collaboration, mutual respect and awareness of the shared-, not separate or dividing history of the past hundred years. It represents a serious reflection about the contemporary societies, about the importance of peace promotion being a joint effort of neighbouring states that share the region of the former frontiers and barriers between cultural traditions, identities, which eventually culminated in violent conflicts.

ID #	5911
Name of property	Çanakkale (Dardanelles) and Gelibolu (Gallipoli) Battles Zones in the First World War
State Party	Turkey
Date of submission	2014
Recommended criteria	(vi)
Brief description	<p>The Gallipoli Campaign also known as the Dardanelles Campaign was a First World War campaign that took place on the Gallipoli Peninsula in the Ottoman Empire between 25 April 1915 and 9 January 1916.</p> <p>The Peninsula forms the northern bank of the Dardanelles, a strait that provides a sea route to what was then the Russian Empire, one of the Allied powers during the war. Intending to secure it, Russia's allies Britain and France launched a naval attack followed by an amphibious landing on the Peninsula with the eventual aim of capturing the Ottoman capital of İstanbul. The naval attack was repelled and, after eight months fighting, with many casualties on both sides, the land campaign also failed and the invasion force was withdrawn to Egypt.</p> <p>Gallipoli Peninsula National Historical Park established in 1973 and included in the UN List of National Parks and Protected Areas, covers 33.000 hectares (330 km²) at the southern end of the Gallipoli Peninsula on the European side of the Dardanelles. The Peninsula, a thin (5 km wide at its narrowest) and 80 km long finger of land, juts into the northwest Aegean Sea to form the southeastern extremity of the European continent. It is surrounded on the northwest by the Gulf of Saros, one of the least polluted corners of the Aegean Sea, and the east by the Dardanelles, a 70 km natural channel connecting the Aegean Sea and Sea of Marmara.</p> <p>The Gallipoli Peninsula, with its unique geographic setting enriched by a beautiful coast line, undulating terrain and diverse scenery, reveals interaction and continuity between different cultural zones and displays non-interrupted settlement from the Neolithic Age on. The dramatic history of the area suggests the "bridge and barrier" predicament of the Peninsula. A bridge-head and a meeting place for different cultures over the centuries, the Peninsula also barred or deterred those in pursuit of territorial expansion. Controlling the Dardanelles, an inevitable channel connecting major inner-seas, it witnessed dense maritime trade flows and took its share. By the same token, it always remained a major concern of military strategy and a site of wars across the ages.</p> <p>Included in the Park are the sites of famous First World War Dardanelles naval and Gallipoli Peninsula land battles. The Park holds an extensive range of sunken ships, guns, trenches, forts, bastions and a myriad of other war related artefacts together with Turkish, Australian, New Zealand, English and French war graves and memorials.</p>

The battlefields, war graves, monuments, and war related artefacts are registered as "historical sites and objects". They should be conserved and their integrity must be retained.
