Memorialization and Democracy:
State Policy and Civic Action

This report is based on the international conference Memorialization and Democracy: State Policy and Civic Action held on June 20-22, 2007 in Santiago, Chile.

The conference and report were made possible by the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA), the Andes and Southern Cone office of the Ford Foundation, the Heinrich Böll Foundation, the Goethe Institute (Santiago), the National Endowment for Democracy, and the Open Society Institute.

Cover photos, top to bottom:
Johannesburg, South Africa. Constitution Hill. Photo by Oscar Gutierrez.

Srebrenica, Bosnia and Herzegovina. Srebrenica-Potočari Cemetery to Genocide Victims. Photo by Louis Bickford.

Gorée Island, Senegal. Maison des Esclaves. Photo courtesy of Maison des Esclaves.

Montevideo, Uruguay. Memorial de los Detenidos Desaparecidos in Parque Vaz Ferreira, Cerro de Montevideo. Photo by Louis Bickford.

Memorialization and Democracy:
State Policy and Civic Action

By
Sebastian Brett
Louis Bickford
Liz Ševčenko
Marcela Rios

CONTENTS

Memorialization and Democracy: State Policy and Civic Action

Sebastian Brett is a researcher for Human Rights Watch. He has written numerous books, including T*he Limits of Tolerance: Freedom of Expression and the Public Debate in Chile* (1998) and *When Tyrants Tremble: Chile and the Pinochet Case* (1999). He currently covers Chile, Peru, Bolivia, and Venezuela. He lives in Santiago, Chile.

Louis Bickford, a political scientist, is the director of the Memory, Museums, and Memorials Program and director of the Policymakers and Civil Society Unit at the ICTJ, where he has worked since its founding in 2001. He has been involved in memorialization initiatives since the mid-1990s and has worked on projects in Bosnia, Cambodia, Chile, and Morocco, among others. From 1999 to 2001 he was associate director of the Global Studies Program at the University of Wisconsin–Madison and managed the Ford Foundation's Historical Memory Initiative in 1998–1999 in Santiago, Chile. He is currently an adjunct associate professor and teaches graduate seminars on memory, memorialization, and human rights at New York University and in the Graduate Program in International Affairs (GPIA) at the New School for Social Research in New York.

Marcela Ríos Tobar is a political scientist and doctoral candidate in political science at the University of Wisconsin. She holds a master's degree in social sciences from the Latin American Faculty of Social Sciences of Mexico. She is the current program officer of the Governance Program in the United Nations Development Program in Santiago. Previously she was the director of FLACSO's Governance Program in Chile. She has taught at the School of Political Science at Diego Portales University, the Advanced Studies Institute of the University of Santiago, ARCIS (Universidad de Artes y Ciencias Humanas), and the University of Chile. She is the coauthor of *A New Feminist Silence? The Transformation of a Social Movement in Chile Post-Dictatorship* and *Quotes of Genre: Democracy and Representation*.

Liz Ševčenko is founding director of the International Coalition of Historic Site Museums of Conscience, a network of historic sites that foster public dialogue on pressing contemporary issues. She works with initiatives in more than 90 countries to design programs and practices that reflect on past struggles and inspire citizens to become involved in addressing contemporary legacies. Before launching the Coalition she was vice president of programs at the Lower East Side Tenement Museum in New York and developed public history projects that catalyze civic dialogue around the USA. She has a master's degree in history from New York University.

I. INTRODUCTION

In the past few decades public memorials such as historic sites, monuments, and museums; certain public art or conceptual art projects; and commemorative events or performances have become critical elements in current struggles for human rights and democracy.

In vastly different contexts communities see public memorialization as central to justice, reconciliation, truth-telling, reparation, and coming to grips with the past—as in Rwanda, where many refused to bury their dead until they were adequately recognized; Morocco, where debates about how to memorialize former torture centers are playing out regularly in the press; Chile, where President Bachelet's proposed "Museum of Memory" has launched vigorous debate; and Cambodia, where two of the top four tourist sites in the capital city are sites related to genocide. Millions of people each year visit, struggle for, or protest against these memory projects. Thus they have become a primary terrain on which diverse constituencies address the enormous and challenging complexities of a traumatic past.

Recognizing the power and potential of memorialization, NGOs, victims' groups, and truth commissions from Peru to Sierra Leone have advocated for memorialization as a key component of reform and transitional justice.[1] A survey of

GLOSSARY

Memorialization is the process of creating of public memorials.

Public memorials are physical representations or commemorative activities that concern events in the past and are located in public spaces. They are designed to evoke a specific reaction or set of reactions, including public acknowledgment of the event or people represented; personal reflection or mourning; pride, anger, or sadness about something that has happened; or learning or curiosity about periods in the past.

Sites of Conscience are public memorials that make a specific commitment to democratic engagement through programs that stimulate dialogue on pressing social issues today and that provide opportunities for public involvement in those issues.

[1] Transitional justice is a field of action and inquiry that focuses on how societies deal with past human rights abuse and atrocity, especially concerning the legal obligations of states in the aftermath of violence, conflict, or mass atrocity. See www.ictj.org for more information.

victims of violence suggested that for the victims surveyed, memorialization initiatives were the second most important form of state reparation after financial compensation.[2]

"Sites of Conscience" seek to tap the power and potential of memorialization for democracy by serving as forums for citizen engagement in human rights and social welfare. Using deliberate strategies, public memorials can contribute to building broader cultures of democracy over the long term by generating conversations among differing communities or engaging new generations in the lessons of the past. Proponents of memorials contend that dealing with conflictive pasts is an essential component of the construction of national identity based on human rights and human dignity, and such initiatives can make a significant contribution to the rebuilding of a devastated society. Whether in an emerging or a long-established democracy, ignoring the past and avoiding policies of truth-telling and justice for victims in general can only hamper the search for stability and peaceful interaction in the present and future.

But memorialization projects hold as much risk as promise for building democracies, depending on the processes that led to their development and management. Memorials that trumpet ethnic superiority (in the former Yugoslavia or Rwanda, for example) may deepen divisions and even provoke violence. Not surprisingly, many of the questions that policy-makers need to ask themselves when developing any other democratic process also should be asked about memorialization initiatives. For instance, should the state or civil society lead such initiatives? Who should be involved and how? Monolithic state projects with insufficient community involvement can be resented by the very people they ostensibly honor. For example, Kurdish citizens of Halabja attacked the state-party-funded memorial honoring their family members killed with chemical weapons, considering it a symbol of local government graft and American influence. Alternatively, projects developed by grassroots groups with no connection to broader state efforts or state support can serve only a specific group of stakeholders isolated in their own reality and might languish in obscurity or have little impact on broader peace-building and transformation efforts.

What sectors of society and what range of disciplines should be involved to ensure that memorialization supports rather than undermines justice and democracy? Activating a former detention center as an ongoing space for citizen engagement on current human rights issues should include human rights activists to connect the site and its stories to ongoing prosecutions; urban planners to help guide its physical development and public access; educators to integrate its history into school curricula; historic preservationists, artists, and exhibit designers to preserve the site as a museum; and tourism managers to promote visitation.

How should such engagement be facilitated? In some cases the form of a memorial can undermine its goals: Although the stated purpose of many memorials is "Never Again!" their design may discourage people from becoming involved in and committed to preventing future human rights abuses. For instance, memorials can be too static, making visitors passive observers rather than active participants; too abstract, so that visitors cannot glean meaning from them; or too detached from other justice initiatives or policy debates. But the deep investment in sites of memory by every sector of society and the contested nature of those sites can be harnessed for productive dialogue and public engagement.

Memorialization remains an underdeveloped, or unevenly developed, field. This may be because memorials are too often understood as outside the political process—relegated to the "soft" cultural sphere as art objects, to the private sphere of personal mourning, or to the margins of power and politics. As a result memorials are rarely integrated into broader strategies for democracy building. Memory sites fall between the cracks of existing policies for historic preservation, transitional justice, democratic governance, urban planning, and human rights. Whereas truth commissions, judicial processes, police reform, and other mechanisms for addressing the past are subject to public scrutiny, few nations or communities have developed analogous expectations, let alone standards of accountability, for memorialization. Yet

[2] Ernesto Kiza, Corene Rathgeber, and Holger-C. Rohne, *Victims of War: An Empirical Study on War-Victimization and Victims' Attitudes Toward Addressing Atrocities* (Hamburg, Germany: Hamburg Institute for Social Research, June 2006).

millions of people mobilize around memorials as important spaces for expressing personal connections to political issues. They often do so with tremendous passion and force, leading in some cases to explosive controversies and even violence.

At worst, excluding memorials from political analysis and public accountability can undermine peace-building and reconstruction processes, providing zones of "symbolic" politics where both national governments and local constituents may promote divisive or repressive messages in ways they could not in other spheres. At best, leaving them out of democracy building squanders their potential to create lasting popular support for truth- seeking and justice, as well as enduring places where each generation can constructively engage with the legacies of past conflict.

Why Memorialization and Democracy?

Memorialization and Democracy, the first international conference seeking to generate diverse strategies for integrating memorialization and democracy building, grew out of three imperatives:

- Memorialization can play a constructive role in shaping cultures of democracy and therefore needs to be taken seriously in any democracy-building project;
- Deliberate local, national, and international strategies are required to ensure that memorials do not undermine other democracy-building efforts but rather complement such initiatives. One of the key actors is government, which can play an important role in helping support initiatives through public policy;
- These strategies require participation of a wide variety of actors from different fields and different locations and must be appropriate in wildly diverse political and cultural contexts.

Memorialization and Democracy brought together theorists, practitioners, and policy-makers from diverse fields to develop innovative approaches to public memorials. The 130 participants came from more than 20 different nations and represented diverse sectors including ministries of culture and human rights, victims' groups and museums, architects, artists, and legal advocates. The conference sought to promote an intellectual and political dialogue on how memorialization can serve democracy efforts around the globe. In particular it focused on strategies for collaboration among and between state and civil society actors.

The meeting was designed to celebrate the specific cultural and historical features of different efforts to address the past, not to develop prescriptions or formulas for what a memorial should look like. But it recognized the need for policy-makers to take memorials seriously as social and political forces and create innovative, self-conscious strategies for integrating memorialization into overall democracy building.

In this sense the meeting's most important goal was to reflect on the potential role of public policy in supporting memorialization initiatives. Participants developed the first set of recommendations for specific ways states and civil society in different national contexts can work together to open memory sites as new centers for lasting citizen engagement in protecting human rights.

Three organizations committed to addressing these issues from different backgrounds and perspectives initiated the conference: FLACSO–Chile, the International Center for Transitional Justice, and the International Coalition of Historic Site Museums of Conscience, whose Chilean member is the Villa Grimaldi Peace Park Corporation. They developed the conference in collaboration with Chilean government and civil society groups. The Ministry of Public Lands served as the official governmental counterpart for the conference, and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Office of the Presidency, and other ministries and governmental institutions participated.

Focus on Chile

Chile was a unique and invaluable venue for this international discussion, as it provided concrete examples of many of the dilemmas, challenges, and issues discussed. Over the past decade memorialization projects have proliferated there. They range from preserving and interpreting sites such as the Villa Grimaldi Peace Park to constructing memorials, such as those in Pisagua and Lonquén, that acknowledge the regional and social heterogeneity of repression. At the same time a wide variety of state and civil society groups have incorporated memorialization into their democracy-building and justice

work. They include the Office of the President, the Ministry of Public Lands (responsible for public sites and state territory), the Ministry of the Interior through its human rights program, housing, and foreign affairs, among others; the Agrupación de Familiares de Detenidos Desaparecidos y de Ejecutados Políticos; and Mujeres de Memoria. In the wake of Pinochet's death Chile serves as a productive starting point to explore how and whether nations should construct policies for preserving sites with controversial histories.

Chile thus provides an important case study and example for other societies, inasmuch as it has made strides to incorporate memorialization into its broader efforts to deal with the past and give voice to victims and their families.

The organizers agreed it was vitally important to visit examples of public memorials and Sites of Conscience during the conference. Participants traveled to a variety of places with diverse approaches to confronting the Pinochet past, from spaces for private mourning, such as the Cementerio General, to places for public dialogue on current human rights issues, such as Villa Grimaldi. These concrete, shared experiences of memorials were crucial in grounding the conference's broader debates. As time was limited participants could choose among four sites: Villa Grimaldi (a co-organizer of the conference); the Cementerio General, the Women's Memorial, and the Paine Memorial.

An Integrated Approach to the Past and Future of Human Rights

The conference explored three interrelated aspects of memorialization and democracy:

- **Theory:** broader questions on the relationship between memorialization and democracy. What is the relationship between how people connect with the past and how they participate in present issues? What does a "democratic" history look like? How can memorials balance between telling objective truths that bring justice to victims and offering multiple perspectives that provide an inclusive, representative, and dialogic view of history? How can different historical narratives contribute to the development of post-authoritarian or post-conflict identities? How does placing physical reminders of a community's violent past in its landscape contribute to building a culture of respect for human rights and peaceful resolution of conflicts?

- **Practice:** forms and strategies at individual sites that most effectively foster citizen engagement in democratic processes. What structures and activities can sites of memory use to create spaces for democratic dialogue? How can they be used to support democracy in both the short and long term? How can they address the immediate needs of victims and involve new generations?

- **Partnerships:** the range of actors that need to work together to support memorials as central components of democracy building. How can states interact with civil society to fashion the best policies for memorialization? How can memorials support truth commissions, tribunals, police reform, schools, community centers, watchdog groups, and other democracy-building projects? How can the state and civil society collaborate best on controversial projects to ease tensions over who "owns" the past and find mutually satisfying solutions?

This report offers a small sample of the rich examples and analyses shared at the conference. It pulls together some of the main threads that emerged from discussions—both positive ideas and words of warning. It is not meant to be a comprehensive summary but a springboard for continuing discussion and analysis. Even this selection of the work going on around the world demonstrates without a doubt that for better or worse, memorialization plays a central role in the direction and shape of civic life and politics. We hope to inspire greater attention to, investment in, and accountability for memorialization, to support lasting cultures of democracy and human rights.

II. MEMORIALIZATION AND DEMOCRACY

A. Framing Memorialization for Democracy

Participants in Memorialization and Democracy discussed wildly divergent places, practices, and principles for publicly remembering the past—so divergent that although their stated goals were often similar, their impact ranged from inciting violence to producing lasting peace. Memorialization, it became clear, is not a monolithic practice with a monolithic result. Thus the choice facing participants was not whether to remember their most difficult past, but how and to what end.

For all the diversity of historical experience and culture that memorialization reflects, the dilemmas and choices involved are repeated in country after country. Should memorials be restricted to dignifying and commemorating victims, or should they have a wider function of creating awareness and fortifying democratic institutions? How can they be designed to retain their relevance and compel the attention of new generations? Is it possible to explain the reasons for the success and failure of memorials? What is the relationship between public memorialization and other mechanisms of transitional justice?

In the rolling hills where the village of Monte Sole once stood before it was destroyed in a Nazi terror raid, the Monte Sole Peace School holds peace education courses for young people from Italy and conflict regions around the world.

Naturally local political and cultural circumstances predominate in the conception and design of memorials, and there is no universal blueprint for success. Yet participants came to the Memorialization and Democracy conference with the belief that many lessons could be learned by comparing experiences. To facilitate our understanding of one another's

mistakes and successes, we needed first to articulate the criteria we used to make choices about memorialization and resolve competing priorities. In other words, we had to explain from our own perspective what we memorialize for. Is our memorialization supporting our visions of democracy?

But public memorials are not identical to cemeteries. What is interesting is the *balance* between the sacred and the profane uses of public space.

The head of ICTJ's memory, museums, and memorials program, Louis Bickford, identified conflicting needs and expectations often placed on memorials. All memorials have both a private side (often, their designers are seeking to create a space for mourning, healing, solemnity, and personal reflection) as well as a public side. This distinction may be seen in sociological terms as the difference between so-called "sacred" and "profane" space.

Public memorials can and do resemble cemeteries—public places for private reflection. In this sense memorials are and always have been deeply connected to the ways people come to grips with the unknowability of death, heal after trauma, and seek immortality by "leaving a trace," in one well-known formulation.[3] Moreover, the public character of cemeteries is important because public acknowledgment and recognition of private suffering is widely understood to be a useful component of meaningful healing.[4]

It is precisely public acknowledgment of private experience that is at the heart of the "reparative" side of public memorials, and the reason they are often linked to reparations policies—efforts by states to focus on the needs of victims in the aftermath of violence and atrocity.

But public memorials are not identical to cemeteries. [5] What is interesting is the balance between sacred and profane uses of public space. Although they usually also include elements of private and sacred experience, many of the memorials discussed here often tip the balance toward the non-sacred, seeking to tell a story about the past that is meant to influence the way we think and act in the future. Not only are they located in public spaces but they are by and large open to—and even actively invite—strangers and people who do not understand or may even disagree with their messages. As is discussed below in more depth, many memorials attempt to provide spaces for a combination of purposes, including personal mourning, spiritual solace, and private reflection on the one hand, as well as civic engagement and democratic dialogue on the other.

One of the purposes of our discussion, then, was to explore more deeply this second and possibly more challenging potential of memorialization. Memorials whose goal is to prevent the repetition of past abuses will ask us not only to remember the victims, but to look inward and think critically about our history and what forces within society or ourselves unleashed the demons of war, racism, or political oppression. If deliberately designed as open forums, they also have the potential to be part of broader democratic reconstruction by fostering dialogue that helps citizens come to terms with the past and understand its relation to the present and future.

Memorials conceived of as more than sacred space or symbolic reparations can thus form an integral part of the long-term objectives of transitional justice. In the transi-

[3] Robert Jay Lifton and Eric Olson, "Symbolic Immortality," in Antonius C.G.M. Robben, *Death, Mourning, and Burial: a Cross-cultural Reader* (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2006).

[4] See Judith Herman, *Trauma and Recovery: the Aftermath of Violence: From Domestic Abuse to Political Terror* (New York: Basic Books, 1997), esp. chapter 9, "Remembrance and Mourning." Also see B. Hamber and R. Wilson, "Symbolic Closure through Memory, Reparation and Revenge in Post-conflict Societies," paper presented at the Traumatic Stress in South Africa conference, Johannesburg, January 27–29, 1999.

[5] For a fascinating examination of cemeteries as they relate to social memory, see Alexander Wilde, "Chile's Memory and Santiago's General Cemetery," paper delivered at the Latin American Studies Association congress, September 5–8, 2007, Montreal, Canada.

tional justice literature, memorials are often categorized as "symbolic reparations." Although this linkage with moral or collective reparations is important, it would be wrong to see memorials and Sites of Conscience only as symbolic reparations. This classification does not adequately capture memorials' potential to provide spaces for civic engagement that can support a wide range of democracy-building strategies over the long term.

As Liz Ševčenko of the International Coalition of Historic Site Museums of Conscience pointed out, a growing number of places of memory around the world are making a commitment to serve as "Sites of Conscience." These are places of memory that take deliberate steps both to remember the past and open public dialogue about confronting contemporary legacies. Sites of Conscience share the goal of "Never Again": of preventing past abuses from recurring. They also recognize that simply creating a public memorial to that past abuse in no way guarantees that it will not reoccur. Instead they work from the premise that the best bulwark against human rights abuse is an active, engaged citizenry with the awareness, freedom, and inspiration to stop abuse before it starts. In a variety of contexts memorials can use creative ways to catalyze this civic engagement by opening new opportunities for dialogue about threats to human rights today and what people can do to address them.

For example, putting buildings impregnated with traumatic memories to a use consonant with democratic values is a way of recovering public spaces or opening formerly closed spaces. Villa Grimaldi Peace Park in Peñalolen outside Santiago transformed a former torture and detention center, where both Chilean President Bachelet and her mother were detained, into a space for solemn reflection and forward-looking public actions, such as performances in the "Theater of Life."

Another example is the Monte Sole Peace School in Italy. Located in beautiful countryside near Bologna, the school was built on the site of a savage massacre in September and October 1944, when SS troops and fascists slaughtered 770 civilians, mostly women and children. The school brings together young people from other cultures in conflict, such as Palestinians and Israelis or Serbs and Albanians, for a three-week peace camp on the site. Participants in the camp learn about what happened at Monte Sole, but because of geography and generation, most have no personal connection at all with the events that took place there. The school's premise is that the site's story can be used to inspire young people in another time and place to resist atrocities in their own context. The project's director, Nadia Baesi, explained:

> Memory and history are intertwined during the visit to the place. Memory poses questions to history, and history tries to give answers until it recognizes that there is no answer that can fully satisfy the fundamental question: how could all that cruelty be possible? This fact opens the discussion, the dialogue and the confrontation. It breaks that question into a thousand other questions, training our minds to doubt, which is the essential premise for accepting our own responsibility toward the past and learning to responsibly look at the present and the future.

In South Africa, Constitution Hill links the vigor of newly established democratic institutions to a site that symbolizes past oppression, highlighting simultaneously the contrasts and the continuity between the two. The precinct includes an old fort, built in 1893, which was used to incarcerate white prisoners, many of them foreign gold prospectors, and was later used by the British to imprison Boers. In 1904 an additional block was added to house black prisoners. The No. 4 block, where brutal treatment was common, came to symbolize the humiliations and indignities of colonialism, as well as the courage and resilience of black activists. Inmates included Mahatma Gandhi and Nelson Mandela, who was held there in 1962. The women's jail housed black women held for crimes such as prostitution, shoplifting, and trespassing. In 1983 the prison was closed and its black inmates moved to lockups in Soweto. After Mandela's election as president the site was chosen deliberately because of its oppressive history to house the fledgling democracy's Constitutional Court. The women's jail now houses the Gender Commission, a LGBT rights group, and the people's defender. The occupation of buildings that once symbolized race supremacy and now stand for tolerance, the rule of law, and constitutional democracy in itself carries a powerful pedagogic message. Constitution Hill's director, Darryl Petersen, explained that the site was designed to be "a gathering space for people to gather, reflect, and converse."

Educational programs for young people include *legotla* dialogues on rights and responsibilities of citizenship, some with the constitutional judges themselves. Other programs invite survivors, schoolchildren, and all citizens to debate how, in light of the past, justice should be defined in the new South Africa. They give opportunities to discuss the many controversial decisions now before the Court.

These civic functions need not always conflict with a community's need for sacred space. The Lorraine Motel in Memphis, Tennessee, the site of Martin Luther King's assassination in 1968, is now preserved as the National Civil Rights Museum. Director Beverly Robertson explained that she had to decide early on whether to preserve the site exclusively as a shrine to a civil rights martyr. A memorial wreath is hung over the balcony where Dr. King was shot, and his motel room is recreated to look as it did in the moments before his death. Or it could be used as a centerpiece of the broader story of civil rights and slavery, a catalyst for discussion of what the nation was and is. In addition to providing spaces and events for contemplation, the museum works with the youth of Memphis to make their voices heard in local politics; organizes mass actions on youth issues such as gun violence; and holds public forums on race in Memphis today.

B. Tensions in Memorialization for Democracy

To pursue the explicit goal of promoting democratic values and practices, memorial projects must confront many tensions and conflicting priorities. For example: Who and what should be remembered? Must all stories be included? For whom are we remembering? Are all memorials open to everyone? Should our memorials focus on serving our immediate needs or take the long view? Participants wrestled with these questions from their own experiences and contexts.

Dialogue vs. Didactics: Balancing Truth-Telling with Multiple Perspectives

Debates over what a memorial for democracy looks like include debates over democracy itself. For some participants the essence of democracy is an inclusive public space open to dialogue from multiple perspectives in which ideas are constantly being contested and debated. For others democracy cannot exist without justice based on a single incontrovertible truth, free from corruption and denial.

Victims, Perpetrators, Resisters

Both the South African and Chilean governments believe truth-telling and reconciliation to be compatible, even interdependent, objectives. South Africa's memorials to the victims of apartheid are an attraction for any visitor to that country. Yet, as former South African Truth Commission member Yasmin Sooka reminded the conference, the commission's chairman, Archbishop Tutu, insisted on humanizing perpetrators as well as victims, and President Mandela made a symbolic point of visiting the Boer Voortrekker Monument in 2002. More than a decade earlier the Chilean government carefully crafted a truth commission to balance polarized views of the causes of repression and political violence and find a consensus on human rights principles by both "sides." The task was fraught with difficulty. But as Alberto Van Klaveren, Chile's deputy foreign minister, put it: "Knowing the truth is a complex and difficult process, but it's indispensable if we are to build a space for encounter and consensus, a space that allows us to affirm that democracy belongs to all of us."

The justices of South Africa's new Constitutional Court constructed their new building on the site of the Old Fort Prison, creating a precinct for debating rights and citizenship past and present.

Should dialogue be all-inclusive? Should efforts to embrace all viewpoints and historical perspectives include Holocaust deniers, apologists for race discrimination, nostalgic Stalinists, or champions of the anticommunist crusade that led

to tens of thousands of deaths in Latin America? Shouldn't memory discriminate when it comes to human rights and democratic values? The overwhelming consensus was that it must. Numerous speakers stressed that the desire for reconciliation and inclusion must never compromise human rights principles and that the promotion of dialogue should never degenerate into an all-permissive relativism. Chile's truth commission made a serious effort to incorporate the opinions of Pinochet apologists, but its attempt to interpret the roots of human rights violations so as to reconcile left and right was ultimately unsuccessful. FLACSO Director Claudio Fuentes took up this point:

> For some the state's job is to reflect a plural memory, the memory of all sides, of society as a whole. Public policies must make it their business to reflect diversity, they say. A central question that must be addressed is whether there is room for all memories in defining a public policy. In my opinion it's a mistake to approach this question from the kind of pluralism which says that any vision is legitimate…. The state has an essential role in defending and promoting human rights. Public policy must embrace the ideal of "Never Again." So public policy can never be neutral in the face of unjustified violence or flagrant violation of human rights.

It can be argued that a once-divided country cannot simply view its past from the narrow perspective of the victims but must somehow adopt a larger view. Yet many Chilean conference participants clearly distrusted this "larger view," just as they rightly consider "reconciliation" to have been a frequent euphemism for capitulation and impunity. For Chilean sociologist Manuel Antonio Garretón the state has a clear obligation to pass on to new generations the ethical principles of truth, justice, and reparation. "All memory," he suggested, "has a private aspect, but there is also a universal component." Space existed for heterogenous and divergent memory, but the "hard-core" values were not negotiable. All Chilean schoolchildren, he said, should at some point gaze in a museum at the shattered spectacles of martyred president Salvador Allende and be given the freedom to reflect upon what they see.

In societies where survivors and perpetrators still live in the same place, it can be physically challenging to create an unadulterated space for victims only. In Argentina the opening to the public of the Navy Mechanics School (ESMA) was delayed for years because relatives and some human rights groups, who had fought for many years for the site to be preserved as a museum, refused to share it even temporarily with the Navy, which could not move out of the building immediately. According to María José Guembe, undersecretary for human rights of the Buenos Aires city government, the issue caused disagreement and tensions within Argentina's human rights movement. A leading human rights NGO, the Center for Legal and Social Studies, had argued against the opinion of most other human rights groups, which was that not opening the site was a lost pedagogic opportunity. Despite these disagreements on timing, Judith Said, coordinator of Argentina's National Memory Archive, hailed the decision to convert ESMA into a memory museum as a "powerfully symbolic event without precedent in Argentine history.… It obliged us all to think as a society what it meant to install a policy of genocide, why it happened, what its consequences were, and how it still affects us both individually and collectively."

Shouldn't memory discriminate when it comes to human rights and democratic values?

But deciding to create a space for the stories of victims hardly resolves the conflict of whose story to tell. Even within the liberation movement, criteria for inclusion may be controversial. Robben Island, the premier site of remembrance in post-apartheid South Africa, has been criticized for not including victims or liberation activists who were not members of the current ruling party, the ANC. Annie Coombs, an art historian from the University of London, pointed out that the struggle against apartheid involved other narratives. The everyday struggle of women in the

domestic sphere is not sufficiently reflected in the official memorials, she felt. Some of these aspects have been addressed in recent initiatives, such as the former women's jail at Constitution Hill in Johannesburg.

After German unification Chancellor Helmut Kohl's efforts to include everybody in the category of victim were widely criticized by civil society groups, academics, and intellectuals, as well as the German Jewish community. Matters were complicated by the fact that the Soviets used death camps like Sachsenhausen and Buchenwald as holding centers for real or suspected Nazis, many of whom died there of malnutrition or disease. Here was another painful narrative that was not told until the 1990s.

In Peru the inclusion in the "Eye That Cries" memorial of the names of former 41 Shining Path guerrillas killed in a 1994 prison massacre shocked many Peruvians, who have bitter memories of the bombings and atrocities this group committed against innocent people. A press campaign was launched, the memorial's closure was threatened, and it was only saved after a public appeal by writer Mario Vargas Llosa. The crisis erupted after the American Court of Human Rights, which had found Peru responsible for the massacre, ordered it to include the names as a reparation measure for the 41 prison victims. In fact their names were already included, as they had been on a list of victims prepared by Peru's Truth and Reconciliation Commission and used by the memorial's designer.

In the end nature came to the monument's rescue, explained its creator, Dutch artist Lika Mutal: "Due to a cleansing I had applied to the stones in November 2006, many of the names had bleached because of the effect of the chemical we used and the sunlight. When the scandal broke the accusers could only find three names."

But the ethical dilemma did not go away. Should all the names be re-inscribed without distinction as before? Mutal finally decided to leave out the names of the prison victims who had a proven criminal record. "I want to remember and re-inscribe the innocent victims, and I cannot see how the terrorists can lie side by side with the innocents," she told Katie Hite in a published interview. But after talking to a father whose student son had "disappeared" at the hands of the security forces, Hite was not so sure. Terrorist or not, he was killed mercilessly in cold blood, condition enough to be included in the memorial. "Traumas and the memories of politics must be spoken," Hite concluded. "They cannot be avoided if we are to imagine a pluralized or democratized politics of any sort. Traumas can be represented, voiced, and acknowledged, even if listeners cannot understand. This does not mean that reconciliation is viable or achievable. But there must be space for voices, many voices."[6]

Alex Wilde, for one, thought that Chile's political culture could benefit from more projects to remember those who stood up to repression. He referred especially to Chile's pioneer human rights organizations as "the light of moral resistance that is part of the country's own history and that of humanity itself." Several at the conference felt he had a strong point. That is, Chileans should remember not just victims, preserve not just places of suffering, celebrate not just dead freedom fighters or resistance martyrs, but also the dogged work in defense of human rights of survivors, including lawyers, teachers, journalists, archivists, and parish priests. Human rights are inspirational to many young people who reject the confrontational language of left-right politics and look to the future, not the past.

Gender

Many conference participants visited Santiago's Women in Memory monument, situated close to the busy Los Heroes Metro station. The monument was designed by young Chilean architects Emilio Marín and Nicolas Norero, the winners of a competition held by the Ministry of Public Works, the Ministry of the Interior's human rights program, and several historical memory groups. It consists of a vertically striped, rectangular glass panel with 42 irregularly placed blank spaces and brightly lit by blue-tinged spotlights positioned at odd intervals on the tiled surface of the street. By coincidence the monument was inaugurated in December 2006 at the same moment Pinochet's body was being cremated.

[6] Katherine Hite, "'The Eye that Cries': The Politics of Representing Victims in Contemporary Peru," *Contra Corriente* 5, no. 1 (fall 2007): 108–34 (www.ncsu.edu/project/acontracorriente).

This elegant installation evokes familiar emblems of the struggle for justice—the placards worn by the mothers and wives of the "disappeared," showing a photo of their loved one, and the improvised candles on the street to mark the spot where a victim fell or was abducted. The striped glass resembles a barcode, said to recall the DNA testing used to identify the bodies of the "disappeared." But the spaces contain no image. This is possibly to reflect the fact that countless women who struggled and suffered under the dictatorship do not feature in public memory at all. In the words of feminist historian Sandra Palestro, the monument is a "transparent wall which does not divide lives, and which from any spot and at any time allows us to look into the future and into the past, through the absent faces on the placards which the relatives of the victims of the repression bear close to their hearts."[7]

The memorial was a major topic in the small-group discussion on memorialization and gender. By omitting names or any physical representation of women, the monument was not just about the thousands of women who "disappeared," were killed or imprisoned under the dictatorship, but the far greater number who fought for life and survival in the face of political violence, unemployment, and poverty. For many this struggle continues in today's pacified Chile. This vital part of the historical narrative gets little attention in the history books.

In fact, all spaces of human interaction are gendered, and public memorials are located in public spaces such as parks, streets, and political, business, or civic areas. These places often represent traditional male power and identity.[8] More specifically memorials and monuments very frequently have focused on the lives of men and male experiences. Even memorials to past atrocity constructed by human rights advocates tend to focus on males, since direct victims of certain kinds of human rights abuse, such as extrajudicial killing or war crimes, are often men, as are the officials who seek to develop public sites.

Yet increasingly the vast array of women's stories is also being represented in public spaces.[9] These include women's heroism during difficult times as well as their varied forms of victimization—from sexual abuse, which is often shrouded in shame, to indirect forms of victimization, such as being left behind as a single mother, often in impoverished conditions, when the breadwinner of a family is abducted and killed by state agents. This innovation is an indication of how the paradigm is shifting and stories about the past are being told from multiple perspectives.

In fact, all spaces of human interaction are gendered.

However, processes of memorialization are not always as inclusive as they could be. For example, some felt that survivor participation in the Santiago monument had been insufficient. One speaker doubted that installations like this could convey a clear "never again" message; apart from the lack of names, there was no visible feminine element in the memorial, unlike such memorials in South Africa. A much more widely shared criticism was that the monument was difficult to appreciate because of its location in a dirty, nondescript area much traversed by hurried commuters and not at all conducive to reflection.

Workshop participants felt that women should participate fully in the memorialization process to assume the task of recollecting women's role in the story. Chilean women have always borne the brunt of responsibility for holding families together in the face of adversity, and women were

[7] "Un muro transparente que no divide las vidas, que en cualquier tiempo y desde cualquier lugar, nos permite mirar hacia el pasado y hacia el futuro, a través de los rostros ausentes en los carteles que los familiares de las víctimas de la represión llevan apretados al corazón." See http://www.noticiasarquitectura.info/especiales/mujeres_en_la_memoria.htm.

[8] See Dolores Hayden, *The Power of Place: Urban Landscapes as Public History* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1997), 7, and Martha Norkunas, *Monuments and Memory: History and Representation in Lowell, Massachusetts* (Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press, 2002 / Landover, MD: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, 2006).

[9] One important example is the Women's Memorial in Whitehall, London, across from 10 Downing Street.

among the main actors in the struggle for justice. As Rhonda Copelon commented:

> When people look at a male monument they know what it is about—the story is the story we all already know. People may know about those women who were immediate victims of human rights violations, but people do not know the multiple stories of women as activists and as caregivers, those who made survival possible. It's difficult to put those multiple experiences into a memorial. We need a multifaceted approach, with histories and narratives.

She hoped that women would have opportunities to tell these stories in the Memory Museum and could participate fully in its design.

The violence that women confronted under the dictatorship continues in different forms today, as several workshop participants noted. Chile still has one of the highest rates of domestic violence in the continent. Vasuki Nesiah said that the "never again" message must be directed not only at conflict or repression on the national scale, but also at ordinary day-to-day violence against women.

Some participants mentioned monuments to women in other countries. Annie Coombs compared the Santiago monument to the Women's Monument in Pretoria commemorating the march of thousands of women in protest against apartheid in 1956, "a political act that many say changed the course of the political struggle." The monument, unveiled by President Mbeki in 2000, stands in an amphitheatre at the Union Buildings. It is a grinding stone set on a metal base. In South Africa grinding is a gendered activity that conveys a traditional image of South African women very different from their role as political activists, which is what the monument celebrates. "It disrupts the focus on women as mother of the nation," Coombes pointed out. A negative feature the monument shares with the Santiago monument is its inaccessibility.

Immediate Victims and New Generations

How can memorials that celebrate traumatic events in an increasingly distant past engage the interest of new generations, whose parents or grandparents were caught up in events of which they have no personal memories? Do memo-

CASE STUDY: CHILE

Chile was chosen as the site of this conference for several reasons. First, it has made exciting progress in reconstructing memory of gross human rights violations, along with steady advances in the courts in holding perpetrators accountable. These often strike many Chilean colleagues as insufficient; but seen in an international context they are certainly impressive. Second, as has so often been the case in the past, the Chilean experience is instructive for other countries. At the same time Chile stands to benefit from other countries' experiences.

Chile recovered democracy after 17 years of dictatorship. This lengthy reconfiguration has gone through several stages. The Coalition of Parties for Democracy, which negotiated with Pinochet and came to power in 1989, has remained in government ever since (although former Pinochet supporters retain considerable behind-the-scenes influence, even today).

During the early years of the transition (1990–1998) in which Pinochet retained control of the army and a stranglehold on the Senate, prosecution of the perpetrators of systematic abuses during the dictatorship's early years made little headway. Memory initiatives went hand in hand with the wider struggle for justice in the courts. Politicians at this time harped on the "unviability" of challenging the biggest obstacle to justice, Pinochet's 1978 amnesty, which so far had exempted from trial all but a couple of perpetrators. Even so, there were some important gains, such as the unchallenged report of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission and the construction of the Memorial Wall at the General Cemetery. A few civil society initiatives also got off the ground, such as the Peace Park at the notorious Villa Grimaldi torture center.

Under the government of Eduardo Frei (1994–2000), progress slowed. With a booming economy, government technocrats gained influence and human rights actors gradually became marginalized. However, this

was not a relentless process of "normalization," as many thought at the time. Everything changed in 1998, when Pinochet finally stepped down as commander-in-chief of the army. Within a matter of months he was arrested on human rights charges during a visit to London. On his return to Chile in 2000, cases against him multiplied in the courts.

With his arrest in Chile, Pinochet's political control began to unravel. President Lagos—famous for once having waved his finger at the dictator during a television debate—built a statue of the martyred President Salvador Allende behind the Moneda Palace and reopened the palace's sealed side door, through which Allende's body had been carried on the day of the coup. Lagos formed the Valech Commission to write a report on political imprisonment and torture, a traumatic legacy in Chile that had never been officially addressed. Two other initiatives made a vital difference: the formation of a specialized police unit to investigate human rights violations and the creation of a human rights program in the Ministry of the Interior charged with representing victims in the courts.

Under President Bachelet, who succeeded Lagos in March 2006, the program has worked with other state agencies and citizens' groups to support a much-expanded memorials program. In October 2006 Bachelet became the first president to pay a visit to the former torture camp at Villa Grimaldi, now the Villa Grimaldi Peace Park. Both the president and her mother are survivors of the camp. Margarita Romero, who directs the Peace Park, quoted Bachelet's speech just before the visit: "I know that I'm going to walk where I walked before, and where my mother walked. And I know that the eternal questions will be more than a whisper: How could it happen? Could we have avoided it? Have we done enough for it to never happen again? Are we now a community based on mutual respect? We can't stop asking those questions."

In March 2003 the government signed an agreement with human rights groups to expand the memorial program. Raquel Mejía, who heads the human rights program, listed 18 sites, including Tocopilla, Calama, Paine, the giant chairs commemorating the brutal murder of three communist party members in Quilicura, Chihuio, La Serena, Punta Arenas, Pisagua, Linares, Osorno, Santa Bárbara and Quilaco, and Chaitén in Chile's far south. A memorial to "women in memory" has been erected on the Alameda, Santiago's main thoroughfare (see below). In addition, plaques have been erected, streets renamed, and memory sites converted into national monuments, including Santiago's National Stadium, once a concentration camp, which now hosts rock concerts.

In each of these initiatives the ministry has worked with other government departments (especially the Ministry of National Properties), regional governments, and municipalities, and in close consultation with relatives' groups. According to Wally Kunstmann of the Metropolitan Association of Former Political Prisoners, the association is helping the Ministry of National Properties create a map of some 800 former torture centers across the country, with signs posted on routes to human rights sites.

The largest upcoming memory project in Chile is a national Museum of Memory coordinated by President Bachelet's office. The Museum is planned as part of Santiago's new Matucana Center, which will commemorate the bicentenary in 2010 of Chile's founding as a nation. It will include memorial spaces for private reflection as well as museum spaces with exhibits and archives remembering political repression and the struggle for human rights in Chile. The larger campus on which the Museum sits will include the offices of human rights organizations that work on human rights issues today.

rials have a limited lifespan? What design decisions can help give them a longer life? If they are designed to commemorate just the victims of a particular conflict, will that limit their universality and the interest they hold for future generations or for people from different cultures? As Annie Coombes put it, "Memories have to be meaningful to future generations as well as the people who experience events being remembered. This conference is about understanding why it is that we need to keep certain memories alive, alive as part of a dialogue that is constantly reconfigured."

How public memory evolves through historical time is an extraordinarily complex question. "Memoryscape" is constantly changing, rather like a theater set being shifted around by a permanently dissatisfied stage designer. The perceived realities of yesterday mutate as they recede in time, and today's generation sees the past through different lenses from those who acted in it. Chileans know this well. Fifteen years ago young people brought up in the consumerist, depoliticized environment of the late Pinochet years were politically apathetic in the extreme. But suddenly teenage apathy seemed to disappear. Surprising everybody, in 2006 another generation of university and high school students took to the streets in their thousands to clamor for educational reform. According to recent polls, FLACSO director Claudio Fuentes said, Chilean young people nowadays seem much more sensitized to the issue of human rights than their parents.

It is not necessarily true that historical memory is at its most acute immediately after the traumatic episode in question and gets progressively blunted thereafter. The evolution of holocaust memorialization in Germany illustrates this. As Sibylle Quack commented, it was almost 40 years after the end of World War II before young Germans, sensitized by the American TV series, "Holocaust,"

> suddenly became aware of the fact that millions of individuals, Jewish families, children, men, and women, had been persecuted and murdered by their parents' generation. What had been known vaguely, mostly in anonymous numbers, and symbolized in pictures of dead bodies, so horrible that one could hardly deal with it, with the help of this TV show now became a face. From the beginning of the 1980s a new generation of Germans formed citizens' groups and initiatives, grassroots historians appeared, and students researched what had happened to Jews in their towns and neighborhoods.

Without this generational shift in German attitudes the construction of the emblematic Memorial to the Murdered Jews of Europe probably would have been impossible. Here was a monument built not just on the initiative of German Jews but one that responded to a change of consciousness in the nation as a whole, as witnessed by the intense debate its construction generated.

"Memoryscape" is constantly changing, rather like a theater set being shifted around by a permanently dissatisfied stage designer.

The German example is one in which a generational attitude shift powerfully affected the timing and quality of memorialization. However, the causal relation can also work in reverse. Memorials can themselves contribute to a change in the attitudes of young people. This possibility raises a practical question. Are there any dos and don'ts to maximize the impact of memorials on future generations?

Margarita Romero, the director of the Villa Grimaldi Peace Park in Santiago, argued that Sites of Conscience must not only impart new information about the past but create new cultures of engagement that promote critical thinking and civic participation by young people. Partnering with more than a dozen schools, the Peace Park invited teachers and students to come to this site of torture and detention and learn about the abuses that took place there and the structures and cultures that supported it. The Park then helped participants apply these lessons to their own reality, hosting discussions on challenges human rights teachers and students experience in the school community today, including xenophobia, racism, anti-Semitism, bullying, and freedom of expression. As Romero described, these

programs were a critical addition to the school curriculum, not only because of the information they communicated, but because they encouraged a new mode of interaction that was critical for building cultures of human rights:

> The Peace Park opens a space of debate and discussion about the recent past which we know does not exist inside many educational establishments in the country. The persistence of an authoritarian school culture, remnants of the old repressive climate, fear of debate, conflict and difference, often prevent us from getting close to painful experiences, but . . . can be transformed into hope of a society more aware of human rights.

Expanding on the success of this program the Park developed traveling exhibitions for schools on the history of Villa Grimaldi and trained 180 youth from 12 schools to serve as exhibit guides. These youth also lead dialogues between teachers and students on issues the exhibits raise in their schools today and the ways students and teachers can work together to address them.

The Gulag Museum at Perm–36 in Russia also recognizes that to pass on the lessons of Stalinism to a new generation requires more than simply teaching students what happened in the past: It requires training students in civic participation by opening space for new forms of communication and debate. The museum's "I Have Rights" program invites students to interview their family and neighbors about their experiences of political repression, opening new conversations in communities about the human costs of Soviet policies of control. Students then participate in a debate about their definitions of freedom and what role individual citizens have in protecting it. These debates not only take on subjects that are not taught in schools, but do so in a format of open, nonhierarchical discussion that does not exist in the authoritarian culture of local schools.

Many public memorials to past human rights abuses seek to ensure that a new generation fights to ensure that those abuses will not happen again. Several participants' work suggests that to do so, public memorials must do more than teach young people what happened; they must also open new spaces for dialogue about how what happened relates to young people's experiences today. These spaces must help young people develop critical thinking skills, the courage to question, and models of nonviolent engagement—all foundations of a culture of human rights.

Tourists and Nontourists

Making memory sites financially sustainable over time is a difficult issue that does not always get the attention it deserves when the initial plans for a site or museum are under discussion. It is obviously desirable that sites should be as self-financing as possible to reduce their dependence on government and their vulnerability to adverse changes in the political climate. In Chile, for example, much needs to be done to make memorial sites more visible, to attract visitors. At present they are not on the tourist map, even though Chile gets more and more visitors every year and is perhaps as famous as South Africa for a history of political repression.

South Africa has a rich experience of working with commercial sponsors, and every year tens of thousands of tourists visit memory sites such as Robben Island and Constitution Hill. But as Darryl Peterson acknowledged, even though tourism makes Constitution Hill economically viable, it should not be allowed to threaten the integrity of the space. "I recently had an offer of 45,000 rand from an American company to throw a 'rave party' on the site," he told the conference. "I could do with the money, but how can I square that with what Constitution Hill stands for?"

Morocco is strapped for cash for its program to convert former detention centers into sites of "historic memory," as proposed by the truth commission, but is a country with huge tourism potential, Louis Bickford pointed out.[10] How to tap tourism's potential without turning sites into Disneyland?

"Yes, there are big risks," Abdelhay Mouudden agreed, reflecting especially on the fact that Morocco is one of the world's prime tourist destinations already. "Look at the difference between Villa Grimaldi, which is obviously hard-up, and Robben Island, which has been overexploited. There must be a middle ground. We have to guard against

[10] See the Web site of the l'Instance Equité et Réconciliation (www.ier.ma)

relying on tourism so much that our sites become just an attraction for visitors' curiosity."

The topic of tourism was addressed in a workshop that included several museum representatives who manage sites with thousands of visitors a year, including professionals, academics, and artists from four continents. Introducing the discussion Katie Hite said she found it strange to talk about tourism in the same breath as sacred sites of memory. She asked participants to imagine a site of quiet mourning and reflection accompanied by the chatter of tourists. Would they imagine the space being invaded by boisterous crowds, graffiti, litter, loud music, souvenir stalls? Or would they recoil at the voyeuristic dimension (trauma tourism)?

Pedro Matta, a survivor of Villa Grimaldi, thought that foreign visitors who have come to Chile since the end of the dictatorship took a commitment to human rights back to their countries of origin; and some of the most important events, such as the Letelier trial or the arrest of Pinochet in London, took place abroad.

Beverly Robertson, director of the National Civil Rights Museum, said that the museum treated the death of Martin Luther King as both a seminal event and a centerpiece to open discussion on the broader story of civil rights and slavery and the emergence of the United States as a nation. The museum is a firmly established tourist attraction.[11] Even though on the tourist map, the museum has strict rules; for example, renting of space for events unconnected with the museum's mission (weddings or parties, for example) is not allowed, Robertson said.

Eloi Coly, deputy director of the Slave House on Gorée Island, Senegal, which receives thousands of tourist visitors every year, stressed how essential it was to protect the site. "We have maybe 300 visitors a day come in by boat; two-thirds of them are foreigners. There's not much space in the Slave House and we receive many children. Sometimes they write on the walls, which we can't allow as it destroys the integrity of the building. So we have to restrict the number of visitors at any time."

"Graffiti can be positive," suggested one workshop participant. "Why not cover the walls with paper or canvas so that the children can write or draw on it, and then make an exhibit of it?"

Sojin Kim, a curator at the Japanese American Museum in Los Angeles, felt that in many cases the advent of tourism at these sites is inevitable—and if the purpose is to preserve and disseminate information from the site about important historical events, this would even be considered desirable. However, not all sites and site stewards will prioritize such an objective. She noted the different ways, for instance, that the former sites in which Japanese Americans were incarcerated during World War II have been preserved. Parts of several camps (a field, a cemetery) have been designated as National Historic Landmarks, and at least two camps have come under the management of the U.S. National Park Service, which has been working to preserve the history of the sites. The Manzanar National Historic Site in eastern California is the most developed of these. Ongoing efforts include an annual pilgrimage program that draws people from around the country, the excavation and restoration of parts of the landscape (such as the gardens created by inmates), and an interpretive center with an in-depth exhibition telling the story of the World War II incarceration of Japanese-Americans. This site receives a fairly large volume

"Graffiti can be positive," suggested one participant at the workshop. "Why not cover the walls with paper or canvas so that the children can write or draw on it, and then make an exhibit of it?"

[11] According to Budget Travel magazine, the museum is one of the 15 places in America that every child should visit before turning 15. In the magazine's May 2007 edition and its Family Travel Handbook, the museum is documented as part of an elite group of "must-see family attractions," according to an NCRM press release.

of visitors—people passing through the small town on their way to resort areas such as Mammoth or Lake Tahoe. This previously little-known story has literally been excavated from the former camp site, made visible, and is now shared with the public.

In contrast, Kim noted, is the former site of the Gila River camp in Arizona, one of two camps that were located on Indian reservations. The Gila River Indian community does not encourage tourism to the site of the camp and tightly restricts access to it. Former internees are granted access, but others desiring to visit the site must make special arrangements with the community in advance. Unlike in Manzanar, buildings were not preserved, nor gardens excavated—although three memorial markers have been installed. But the community has also not removed or covered the remnants of the camp. Instead the former site sits vacant—farming has developed around it. In this state, and without preservation efforts, all traces of it may eventually disappear as nature takes its course. It reflects a different approach from Manzanar's to memorializing an event. Reverence and respect also underlie this approach, but it does not interpret the event for outside people or tourists.

Peru is a popular tourist destination, but memory sites there are not on the tourist map. Lika Mutal, the designer of the "Eye That Cries" memorial, believed that tourism should be encouraged to provide income when there is no state subsidy, and to give local people a sense of pride. She said the site could be developed without help from the state, for example by providing a bookstore, coffee shop, place to rest, and documentation on the historical background. Advertising is necessary to get the site on the tourist map. Visitors could be asked to make a $1 donation to help cover costs.

C. Constructing Public Memorials: Forms and Process

Wide cultural differences in the ways societies deal with remembrance, as well as diverse local political and economic contexts, make it unwise to contemplate any blueprint for the form of memorials. Abdlehay Moudden, a member of Morocco's Equity and Reconciliation Commission (Instance Equité et Réconciliation, IER), prefaced his remarks on memorialization and democracy by stating wryly: "In Morocco we don't have any memorials and we are not generally considered to be a democracy. Morocco is a kingdom without museums, statues, or memorial plaques. We have so much history as part of our daily lives that we have no use for monuments or icons. I don't apologize for this situation; it's simply another way of addressing the past. Creating memorials is virgin territory for us."

But the IER's report, which was submitted to and approved by the king, made recommendations on memorial sites and identified eight former detention centers in five regions of the country to be rehabilitated as cultural centers, including libraries that focus on human rights, biographies of victims, and spaces for NGOs to hold dialogues and develop projects. The government has to find ways of reconciling these projects backed by the IER with the work the Human Development Commission, with which it has recently merged. Human rights and memorial sites cannot be imposed on poor communities lacking basic services at the expense of vital development projects, Moudden insisted. One proposed steel abstract statue in the middle of the desert would have cost a total of $600,000, plus another $8,000 for transportation. "Can you imagine this modern steel sculpture in the middle of a community that doesn't have running water?" he asked. A major challenge is finding ways of reconciling memorial art with the needs of local communities, not just copying the West but finding a symbolic expression that speaks to the local context and culture.

Victims' groups drape the fence of the ESMA Naval Academy with portraits of the thousands of people who were detained and disappeared there.

Memorial art, like the dynamics of the memorialization itself, is diverse and context-dependent. In many Latin American countries it reflects vernacular customs as well as long-established monumental traditions. The central squares of most Latin American cities feature equestrian statues of former independence heroes, busts of statesmen, or monuments commemorating nineteenth-century battles. Some recent monuments, such as the flag-draped statue of deposed president Salvador Allende opposite La Moneda government palace or the memorial to the "disappeared" in Santiago's general cemetery, reflect these formal civic traditions. But other, smaller monuments in Chile are closer in style to *animitas*, the tiny flower-adorned shrines that mark fatal accident spots on the roads, placed there and maintained by mourners for years afterwards. The memorial to the "disappeared" in Paine, for which each family designed and made a tablet commemorating a loved one, recalls the homemade quality of animitas; another example is the roadside shrine in Quilicura, located at the spot where bodies were found of three victims of the dictatorship who were abducted and murdered in 1985.

Memorial forms can encourage us to confront human cruelty by going on an inward journey. The "Eye that Cries" memorial in Lima manages to combine solemnity with introspection and truth-telling. The memorial is composed of a gravel path lined on both sides with smooth stones bearing the names of 27,000 victims of Peru's 20-year civil conflict. The circling path leads to a large weeping rock, symbolizing the Inca earth goddess Pachamama. As described by its creator Lika Mutal, "The labyrinth extends for an 800-meter walk, in which the string of names [inscribed on smooth stones] with ages from 0 to 90 overwhelms the walker, who is faced by life and death. In front of the names of the victims resting one against another, our differences and truths become hollow; one basically comes up against one's own life and one's own conscience."

A large group of volunteers inscribed the names on the stones, awakening consciousness of the victims as individuals in the very process of creating the monument. Mutal likened walking up the path to meditation: "A memorial can awaken this consciousness and return the person to their beginnings, to their intuition and connect them to this quality which Andean spiritual teachers call *munay*, which means the ability to cure the heart. From this source introspection and dialogue can begin."

Using memorials not only to commemorate victims but also to stimulate a dialogue about the past raises a special challenge for artists. Ralph Buchenhorst, of Berlin's Humboldt University, noted, "It's questionable whether the means of artistic communication are capable of giving visible form to mass extermination." The Holocaust throws into question not only humanistic conventions but the very formal conventions of art; how could objects, signs, or buildings in any sense represent or contain the dimensions of that horror? The 2,700 concrete slabs in a field of uneven ground that make up Peter Eisenman's design for the Monument in Memory of the Murdered Jews of Europe are intended to provoke a sensation of unease, instability, and solitude in visitors, inducing sober introspection. But once installed a memorial may be used in ways that surprise and even disturb its planners. In the case of the Berlin memorial, children soon realized that the slabs of varying heights had great potential for games; adults used them as a backdrop for photos or picnicked in their midst, while a local entrepreneur built a snack bar and souvenir shop nearby. For the planners such transformations may dilute or deface the message of a monument. Yet, if we want to provoke dialogue, is it desirable to impose more than minimal controls on public interaction with monuments?

> The style was a recipe for amnesia, inoculation from infection by the past.

Even commercial spaces can be infused with references to the past, offering a new sphere for memorialization. Bernard Khoury returned to his native Lebanon from the United States in 1993, determined to play a part in the effort to reconstruct Beirut after the civil war. "It took me a few years,

too much paper architecture, and many aborted projects to realize that I was operating on the wrong front. The reconstruction project I was expecting never happened." All the rebuilding of Beirut's inner city, Khoury explained, was undertaken by Solidere, a private company that imitated the styles of the latest corporate architecture, hired star international architects to develop the concepts for certain key sites, and then handed the jobs to "docile" local architects. The style was a recipe for amnesia, inoculation from infection by the past. "No Lebanese architect is entitled to build on those key sites in the Solidere area. If we as Lebanese are unable to intervene in such a politically symbolic area, it's a sad story."

Somewhat disillusioned, Khoury turned to the private sector, specializing in entertainment projects like nightclubs and restaurants for the cosmopolitan rich that mirror the urban contrasts of contemporary Beirut. The site of one of Khoury's projects, a luxurious sushi bar, is next-door to a derelict building still occupied by refugees who live without running water or even windows. His discotheque, built underneath the vacant site where a massacre of Palestinian refugees took place in 1976, emerges from underground only at night. Khoury's buildings celebrate these cruel contrasts. "My entertainment projects are about recognizing and confronting different social realities and try to make these issues visible. In that sense these projects are very contextual." Unlike the anodyne office blocks that now populate the inner-city area, erasing all visible signs of the violent conflicts that have marked Lebanon's history, they are intended to challenge the visitor.

Some conference participants were uneasy about the implications of Khoury's approach. "Wasn't the disco sustained on the erasure of memory? Was there no sign inside that this was a place of pain?" asked one.

"In this political context, there is no audience for moralizing statements," Khoury explained. Conventional monuments become meaningless. "How can you do anything when the actors of the civil war and of today's 'peace' are the same people? There are no memorials in Lebanon for the victims of the civil war." Instead of trying to anchor memorials in a nonexistent public space, Khoury engages unashamedly with capitalism and development, and places memory at the center of everyday private activities, even those that are hedonistic.

Making the Process Part of the Product: Community-built Memorialization

Which is most important: the debate over who, how, and where to remember and the democratic quality of the process of making those decisions, or its end result? As Quack put it: "Debates on the Holocaust and on Holocaust memorials are full of ambivalences, embarrassments, and often of dissent. At the same time, these struggles keep memory alive and are part of the democratic decision-making process."

Many memorial projects have pursued the goal of promoting democratic values and practices by facilitating community involvement in the debates and development of the memorial itself. The memorial erected at the spot where South African student protester Hector Pieterson fell at the beginning of the 1976 Soweto uprising suggests a possible answer. According to Yasmin Sooka, "The young curator Ali Hlongwane has managed to make the memorial a project owned by the community and has, in contrast to the many other projects sponsored by the state, engaged in a process which is inclusive, allows for a diversity of views, and has proven to be a space where young people can engage on issues of the past."

Several projects aimed to map the route taken by the students during those fateful days. The June 15 Foundation (which was responsible for the project) and the Johannesburg Road Council held workshops to debate what had precipitated the uprising, who had been the main actors, and how the events should be memorialized. As Sooka explained, the key to this positive experience was the curatorial team's conception of the monument as a memorial that would keep living links with the immediate locality.

> The mapping of the route of the uprising provided the space for the community and those involved in the uprising to reconstruct their struggle against injustice. It provided an opportunity for dialogue. The major contribution it has made is to deal with the plurality and diversity of experiences. It has challenged the notion of public history that wants to construct memory as a static and unified collective.

How, Ralph Buchenhorst asks, can a multiplicity of voices be conceptualized in the work of memorial art itself? Buchenhorst showed some recent examples of German Holocaust memorialization art that to varying degrees attempted to "democratize" memory by transforming the spectator into an author and actor and replacing the monument as a fixed artist-designed entity with an interactive, open-ended process. The best example was Jochen Gerz's monument against fascism in Hamburg, a 12-meter-high, lead-faced column that slowly disappears into the ground. Comparing Germany and Argentina, Buchenhorst noted that some Argentine artists, such as Rodolfo Aguerrebery, Julio Flores, and Guillermo Kexel, have also created works in which memory is recreated during the realization of the performance, not represented by an object or a static exhibition.

Chile provides another example. In the rural community of Paine, a short drive south of Santiago, is a memorial commemorating 70 agricultural workers from the community who "disappeared" in the early years of the dictatorship (proportionately the highest figure anywhere in Chile). The families of the workers collaborated on the design of each "portrait." Juan René Maureira, a grandson of one of the victims, explained:

> The idea was to celebrate the person through the memories we had of them, their qualities, and their passions and interests as people. All of the family, young and old, could participate in that and it was a healing process. We wanted to get away from the horror of those days. Horror and fear can be paralyzing. We wanted to avoid dehumanizing memory and return to our emotional center. The best way of doing that was to remember our loved one as he really was, or at least how we remembered him.

Situated precariously close to a busy highway, the monument consists of rows of poles of varying heights, apparently intended to reflect the contours of the Andes. On the ground between the poles are 70 colorful mosaic tablets, each representing one of the victims and designed and made by surviving relatives. A few were straightforwardly political (like one bearing the logo of the MIR, an illegal leftist group decimated after the coup). But many others depicted more mundane scenes drawn from memory, often with affectionate humor and decorated with familiar images: a horse, a dove, a tractor, a barn, and the ubiquitous mountains.

Perhaps the success of the Paine memorial owes something to the fact that Paine remains a tight-knit agricultural community (even the landlords who participated in the post-coup repression still live nearby). The historical continuity of communities like Soweto and Paine may favor interaction and dialogue more than the dispersed lifestyle of a metropolis does. Even so, whatever the environment, a key to building community ownership of memory may be to keep its human scale and avoid historical or political abstractions that alienate as well as unite. Ideas and political ideals are notoriously changeable, whereas human qualities remain obstinately immutable. It is this immediately recognizable humanness that enables the viewer to empathize, crossing generational as well as cultural barriers.

Former prisoners return to Perm–36, where thousands of political prisoners were held from the Stalin era through the late 1980s, now preserved as the Gulag Museum.

D. The Role and Obligation of States

States are scrutinized and held accountable for maintaining democratic structures and principles such as freedom of the press or checks and balances on power, but not for their approaches to remembering the past. Repression or neglect of history and memory remains both a bellwether of and a catalyst for other forms of repression. Nonetheless, standards concerning the role of states in dealing with the past are starting to emerge, even if practice lags behind. In

his opening paper Louis Bickford noted that in periods after mass atrocity or human rights abuse, states have at least four kinds of obligation according to international law: They must establish the truth about victims and perpetrators, pursue criminal accountability for perpetrators, develop reparations programs for victims, and take steps to guarantee nonrepetition, often understood as the obligation to pursue institutional reforms. The duty to remember does not exactly fit any of these categories. Yet it is implied by at least three of them. It is implicit in the duty to establish the truth; it can be a form of symbolic reparation for the victims and their families; and memorials, if developed as inclusive spaces for dialogue on contemporary issues, can help strengthen democratic values and a culture of respect for human rights.

In periods after mass atrocity or human rights abuse, states have at least four kinds of obligation according to international law.

An emerging norm calls for the obligation to remember and engage with past atrocity.[12] Certain United Nations standards, for example, are clear. Both the Joinet Principles and the updated Joinet/Orentlicher Principles call attention to the duty to remember. Resolution 60/7 on Holocaust remembrance, adopted by the UN General Assembly in November 2005, urges member states to develop educational programs on the Holocaust "to help to prevent future acts of genocide." It rejects Holocaust denial and commends states that have preserved former concentration camps as memory sites. The Basic Principles and Guidelines on the right to a remedy and reparation for victims of gross violations of international human rights law and serious violations of international humanitarian law, adopted by the General Assembly in December 2005, include among reparation measures that states must provide "commemorations and tributes to the victims" and "an accurate account of the violations that occurred in international human rights law and international humanitarian law training and in educational material at all levels." Governmental truth commissions in Chile, South Africa, Peru, and Morocco, among others, have included in their recommendations the celebration of memory as symbolic reparation for victims.

Despite these emerging norms, the ways states engage with public memorialization and Sites of Conscience are inconsistent. Victor Shmyrov, director of the memorial museum at the former Gulag camp Perm–36, told the conference that the museum had received no funding from Moscow, although it had some limited support from regional authorities. That support was now dwindling, threatening the existence of the museum in its present form. The Andrei Sakharov museum is also in financial difficulties, Shmyrov said, as is the "Memorial" movement, which spread throughout the country during the perestroika period. Sergei Kovalyov, a trustee of the Memorial Society and the International Coalition of Historic Site Museums of Conscience, pointed out that "usually there are all types of silences and censorship where people in post-totalitarian governments are covering up the dirty and bloody past, making the past a secret of the state. Viktor and I live in a country where people are still disappearing, where executions are done without cause, and where torture is applied."

Jan Munk, director of the Terezín Memorial in the Czech Republic, bore witness to how the communist Czech state controlled public memory as part of its broader program of control. The Czech government established the Terezín Memorial in 1947 to remember the Nazi occupation at the site of the Holocaust ghetto and transport station. Under the communist regime the state controlled the story that was told at the site, describing a struggle against fascism with no mention of the persecution of Jews. In the early 1990s the museum was reconceived and redesigned to address

[12] See Louis Bickford, "Memory and International Law" (January 2007); contact lbickford@ictj.org.

the Jewish Holocaust for the first time. Today the site is officially independent of the state, although the majority of its budget comes from the Ministry of Culture. Munk reported, however, that the current government's democratic principles were reflected in the ways it treated the site. "We are limited by the state in what we do in very, very few ways. In comparison with the problems faced by sites in other parts of the world, we are without problems."

Germany is another case in point. Sybille Quack, former managing director of the Memorial to the Murdered Jews in Europe, noted that there were no memorials to the victims of the Holocaust in East Germany until the collapse of the Berlin Wall. Official dogma dictated what "conversations about the past" were possible. "All over the country there were memorials and plaques remembering the anti-fascist resistance, as well as presenting historical role models for the current society. But the fate of different victims' groups, and especially of the murdered Jews, was not or almost not remembered."

The case of Argentina also demonstrates the close relationship between policies of memory and democracy. The Full-Stop and Due Obedience Laws, enacted in 1986 and 1987 after military rebellions, held fast for nearly two decades, blocking trials in the courts. As Judith Said, general coordinator of the National Memory Archive, put it, "During the 1990s, while the state provided economic compensation for the victims of political imprisonment, forced disappearance, and summary execution, it also promoted the impunity of the perpetrators and appealed to those well-worn euphemisms of national reconciliation and the need to leave the painful past behind."

The turning point came in 2003, when with prodding from President Nestor Kirchner the Argentine Congress finally overturned both laws. The new political climate favored memory initiatives, too. In December of that year Kirchner created the National Memory Archive, dedicated to obtaining, analyzing, and preserving testimonies and documents about Argentina's "Dirty War" (1976–1983). In March 2004 the archive assumed responsibility for administering a "memory space" on the site of the notorious torture center at the Navy Mechanics School (ESMA), which opened on schedule in October 2007. In contrast, in 1998 President Carlos Menem had proposed to demolish the building and erect on the site a "monument to national unity." Human rights groups fought the proposal, and in June 2000, long before Kirchner's election, the Buenos Aires city legislature approved a law revoking the navy's lease on the site and reserving it for the construction of the museum.

Although the Peruvian government has begun implementing a reparations plan, it has provided no support for the one major human rights memorial in the country, the "Eye That Cries" in the Lima municipality of Jesús María. Although a sympathetic mayor provided a 27,600 square-meter section of the Campo de Marte park, all the money for the project came from private donors. Since then the municipal government has changed and become decidedly unsympathetic. As described above, the memorial was hit by a deluge of criticism because its creator had unknowingly included the names of people believed to have been members of armed insurgent groups in the list of victims.[13]

Kovalyov recommended that the international community establish a mechanism for evaluating state efforts to preserve historical memory in post-repression societies, a kind of scorecard that would encourage governments to try to improve their ranking. No such mechanism now exists, but attempts are going on to measure how states address past abuses.

Liz Ševčenko suggested that any national or international standards for memorialization should reflect similar standards for democracy. Memorials must be understood not as art objects but as democratic spaces, analogous to other kinds of institutions that would be considered foundational to a healthy democracy. As such they deserve and require serious investment of resources and strategy. Whether developed by states or civil society, memorial projects should be held to democratically defined standards. For instance, they should be accountable for their transparency, inclusiveness, public participation, truthfulness, responsiveness, and other criteria.

[13] In September 2007, hours after former president Alberto Fujimori's extradition from Chile to face trial for human rights abuses and corruption, a group of his supporters overpowered a police guard and desecrated the monument with hammers, chisels, and orange paint.

Challenges for State Projects

Transitional governments usually have political priorities they consider more urgent and demanding than their debt to survivors of past repression. They are often bent on creating political alliances—particularly with sectors close to the former rulers— that permit governability and avoid disruptive conflict that might abort the consolidation of democracy. The great temptation at this stage is for insecure governments to cave in to pressure to "turn the page" on the past. But it is much more difficult for societies to turn their back on a brutal past than many governments seem to imagine. "Memory eruptions" occur from time to time, suddenly re-opening wounds and putting the past back on the front pages of newspapers. When governments drive memorialization initiatives, therefore, they often seek to neutralize disagreements about the past and develop a unified national narrative. In contrast, when civil society drives memorialization efforts, the narrative may seek to challenge official truths.

"Memory eruptions" occur from time to time that suddenly re-open wounds and put the issue of the past back on the front pages of newspapers.

One of the greatest challenges facing post-conflict governments is to confront the existing landscape of memorials—the streets, statues, and other symbols all around them that promote the values and people the new regime is working so hard to reject. Laurence Konmla Bropleh, a former World Council of Churches representative who is now Liberian Minister of Information, Culture, and Tourism, told the conference that Liberia has schools, streets, and public holidays named after dictators who rigged elections, burned ballot papers, and intimidated opponents. It is estimated that at least 200,000 died in armed conflict between 1979 and 2003, when President Charles Taylor went into exile. A Truth and Reconciliation Commission set up by President Ellen Johnson-Sirleaf is expected to report next year. Government memorialization plans include turning the now-ruined political prison of Bella Yelleha into a museum. Although Taylor is on trial in The Hague on war crimes charges, other civil-war factional leaders are still active in Liberian politics. "The current government is committed to democratic memorialization and strengthening democratic institutions," said Bropleh. But he also noted, "Liberian history is full of squandered opportunities."

The fact that human rights memorials are often erected within an existing official memoryscape in which they sit side by side with symbols of oppression poses problems, as Bickford noted. Official memorials are always an expression of institutionalized power, a representation of history set in stone or metal that says, "This is way things were and are." Fahim Hakim, vice-chair of Afghanistan's Independent Human Rights Commission (AIHRC), noted that Afghan governments used memorialization initiatives to bolster their legitimacy or to "manipulate people to recognize pro-government personalities as their heroes or national figures." Indeed, a participant in a conference organized by AIHRC suggested that statues of war criminals should be erected and unveiled on symbolic days so that "victims and survivors of their atrocities and barbarian behavior … could express their hatred toward them by stoning and throwing rubbish at their images." Many victims desire revenge when their rights and desire for justice are ignored. For Hakim, honoring victims also entails "de-memorializing imposed memories based on political compromises and deals." Finding symbols with which all can identify in bitterly divided societies in which more than two-thirds of the population consider themselves victims, as in Afghanistan, is a tremendous challenge.

In South Africa monuments were symbols of white supremacy for decades. What should happen there to the Voortrekker Monument, erected in 1949 to commemorate the heroism and self-sacrifice of the Afrikaner Great Trek? Mandela made a point of visiting the monument, and it still receives a state

subsidy. This is an admirable display of tolerance and fair-mindedness on the part of the authorities, many would say. The executive director of the Foundation for Human Rights in South Africa, Yasmin Sooka, disagreed:

> In the main, the overwhelming feeling you come away with when you examine the murals is the depiction of black people as untrustworthy and treacherous. What does this mean for young people, both black and white, that go there? It is necessary to allow Afrikaners the space to celebrate their own history. However, when it is depicted in a way that demeans the other, and which lacks any acknowledgment of the distortions that have taken place, then one has to question the wisdom of the state supporting this museum. Is this not taking reconciliation too far?

However, as Sooka acknowledges, the dilemma was resolved to some extent by the government decision to transform a 52-hectare site on Salvokop Hill, directly opposite the Voortrekker Monument, into a Freedom Park. The aim was to "embrace a history that cannot be ignored … to illustrate the contrast that can help reconstruct our country." Even then ethical and political choices in the park's design were unavoidable. A Garden of Remembrance in the park will honor all South Africans who have contributed positively to the nation's development. But what ethical criteria underlie that choice? And who decides? Sooka identified a problem that memorialization faces in any society divided by internal conflict: "How do we integrate all of our different experiences and how do we share a common understanding of the rich plurality that comes from our diversity?" Heated debates took place over the names that should be inscribed on the Sikhumbuto Memorial Wall, also situated in the Freedom Park, for those who died in the struggle for freedom.

Integrating Memorialization into Democratic Reconstruction

The moment a government recognizes the importance of memorialization as a component of truth-telling and democratic reconstruction, it must develop a philosophy and a strategy to guide its actions in this area. As FLACSO director Claudio Fuentes pointed out, historical memory is a new and fairly uncharted area of public policy.

Several speakers at the conference believed that the state's responsibility for memory initiatives should be transversal—shared and developed in different ways by different government departments, such as education, health, and gender equality. In Chile one example is the work undertaken by the Ministry of Public Property to create a map of public buildings used as detention centers during the dictatorship.

In Morocco, on the other hand, a major memorialization project is being framed as economic development while supporting human rights goals. As Dr. Abdelhay Moudden reminded the conference, memorials stem from a Western secular civic tradition and are without roots in Muslim political culture. The major challenge to policy-makers following the publication of the IER's report was how to make monuments relevant and meaningful to local people grappling with poverty in the remote areas where most memory sites are located. Policy-makers took a political decision to combine these sites to commemorate victims of human rights violations with developmental efforts. This provoked controversy. Should memorials concentrate on human rights violations per se or extend to other issues at the risk of trivializing victims? By concentrating on solutions to economic and social marginalization, the government was at the same time highlighting the context in which the violations had occurred. A similar approach has been adopted in Peru, where human rights violations and the economic, social, and cultural exclusion of the highland Quechua-speaking population have been linked for generations.

Opportunities and Challenges for State and Civil Society Collaboration

Although governments have started memorial projects on their own initiative, more often the initial impetus comes from survivors and human rights groups as part of their wider campaign for truth, justice, and reparation. Civil society has played the most dynamic and creative role in memorialization, just as advances in the courts have resulted mainly from its tenacious campaign against impunity.

In both Chile and Argentina elected governments have now embraced the agenda of the human rights NGOs much more emphatically than did earlier post-transition administrations. This acceptance can have its dangers for civil

society. In Chile, Alexander Wilde noted, "civil society was involved in some important early memorialization (such as the Memorial Wall and the Peace Park at Villa Grimaldi), but family groups and remnants of the human rights movement were gradually marginalized by the government."

Models do exist of productive collaboration toward common goals. Both Argentina and Chile are notable for the close collaboration between civil society groups and government agencies on specific memory projects in recent years. Patricia Valdez, the director of the Argentine NGO Memoria Abierta, explained how the organization embarked in 2001 on an ambitious program to preserve the memory of state terrorism. It is developing a 70-hectare space in Buenos Aires' Indoamerican Park for a "Human Rights Walk" composed of 20 groves bordered by poplars, each with 20 trees of a chosen species commemorating a particular group of victims of state terror. The under-secretary for the environment provided the site, and local residents' associations, environmental groups, and government agencies participated in discussions about the concept and design of the walk. In 2006 Memoria Abierta organized "Images for Memory," a traveling multimedia exhibition about political repression in Argentina—and also, notably, about the recovery of democracy. Students participated as guides and more than 3,000 schoolchildren viewed it. The minister of foreign affairs inaugurated the exhibition, which has received support from other government ministries as well as the presidency. Speaking as a representative of the Argentine government, Judith Said described the change of vision of memory and justice under the Kirchner administration as "Copernican."

Until Kirchner's election the autonomous city of Buenos Aires, and particularly the city council, spearheaded memory initiatives in Argentina. The city's under-secretary for human rights, María José Guembe, herself a former lawyer for the nongovernmental Center for Legal and Social Studies, explained that starting in 1997 the relatives' groups and NGOs had begun work to recover memory sites. It was a "step that was taken with considerable difficulty," she explained; in the context of impunity some activists saw a concern with memory as a diversion from the struggle for justice. After a rich debate in a public hearing in 1997, the city legislature accepted a proposal to create a Memory Park on the River Plate including a sculpture park and a monument for victims of disappearance and execution. A Pro-Monument Commission, consisting of human rights representatives as well as city legislators and officials, has been responsible for organizing a sculpture competition. Other projects undertaken by the city in close collaboration with relatives' associations and human rights groups include the recovery as memory sites of several former secret detention centers such as the Club Atlético, El Olimpo, and Automotores Orletti (center of operations for the "Condor Plan" in Argentina).

> The state's responsibility for memory initiatives should be transversal—shared and developed in different ways by different government departments, such as education, health and gender equality.

Guembe noted that in each project civil society groups, and in some cases local residents, participated alongside city government representatives on an equal footing. Notably, all of these projects receive city government funding without any donations or contributions from private sources. The ESMA project is the only one in which both federal and city government personnel and funding are involved.

Each of the Argentine guests at the conference recognized that this civil society-government cooperation has not been without friction and disagreements. Despite the time that has passed rivalry still exists between some NGOs, as well as suspicion toward government entities. Guembe, who made this point, also believed that the financial burden on

the state was more onerous than it need be. Could there ever be too many memory sites? Survivor groups tended to want every detention center to be taken over as a memory site, involving acquisition costs as well as maintenance and security, raising questions of future sustainability. As it was, the budget allocated by the city legislature to these projects often fell short of requirements. The danger was that by overstretching to accommodate every demand, city government was making the memory program more vulnerable to future cutbacks, particularly if an unsympathetic government were elected to city hall. Patricia Valdez also believed that government authorities often acceded to relatives' requests without sufficient discrimination. Some relatives' groups were too concerned with their own agendas and not happy to accept compromise. "There are two many circular debates, and decisions end up being taken in a rush," she noted.

Laurence Bropleh stressed the need for civil society groups to engage more effectively with governments. "When human rights groups push an agenda for memorialization, the challenge is not only to point out abuses but also to give credit when the government has done something positive. If you don't do this, governments get discouraged. In Africa we have a saying: 'If you want to walk fast, walk alone. If you want to walk far, walk together.'" He suggested that the ideal role for the state is as a strategic facilitator to provide resources and guidance for civil society memorialization efforts, because of the need for an overarching strategy that puts available resources to effective use and seeks to generate interest and support from the international community.

A common tension between state and civil society memorialization agendas involves building centralized, national museums versus constellations of smaller, community-based projects. States often feel they are best suited to, and best served by, centralized national museums. Such projects seek to synthesize the experiences of all the people of the country and create a space for all people to come together; they are high-profile achievements for a political administration, and they allow scarce resources to be focused. These projects face the challenge of building broad participation and support by diverse stakeholders, so they are not designed or perceived as political instruments or prizes of a single administration. Civil society groups are often behind local, community-based projects rooted in the experiences of specific people and places. They often have stronger community investment and involvement. Collectively they can articulate a multiplicity of perspectives that can provide a more nuanced understanding of the past and its contemporary legacies than a single official, national narrative. Of course, these are not necessarily mutually exclusive alternatives. But creating a balance among them will require difficult choices about allocating scarce resources.

III. CONCLUSION

The goal of the conference was to consider how government and civil society could interact in creative and constructive ways to foster public memorialization that contributes to democratization. The conference made no firm resolutions or recommendations, but it did reach the following tentative conclusions.

Respecting Unique Contexts; Reflecting on Connections

There can be no single blueprint for public memorials, nor a recipe for what they should be or what they should look like. On the contrary, the worst thing we can do is to imitate models or try to export them. This would threaten the two most necessary components of creating public memory sites—context and creativity.

Even given regional and local specificities, participants agreed that much can be learned from the experience of others who met similar challenges elsewhere. Participants from a wide variety of countries found that they faced many similar questions and debates, although their answers were unique to their own context. Some lessons can be transferred across vast regional and cultural differences. In particular, seeing how other societies create projects to learn from and engage with the past can trigger creative ideas in other contexts.

Developing Explicit Strategies

Perhaps the most important lesson taken from this conference in a general sense is the importance of developing explicit goals and strategies. What is the purpose of creating a memorial or developing a Site of Conscience? Is it to mourn? To teach? To foster dialogue about the past and address its legacies today? And how will these goals influence the strategies?

For example, participants agreed that building a memorial to past atrocities does not guarantee "Never Again." For a memorial to support a culture of resistance against human rights abuse, it must develop and clearly articulate deliberate goals and strategies in its process, form, content, and programming. A growing number of memorial projects around the world are making an explicit commitment to serve as "Sites of Conscience": memorials that both remember the past and host open dialogue on how to confront its contemporary legacies.

Government and Public Policy

Strategies must be developed not only for individual memorials but for broader policies that support them. Governments negotiating the complex terrain of post-conflict or post-authoritarian societies should recognize the potential value of memorialization to support overall programs of democratic reconstruction. Done thoughtfully and in partnership with a wide variety of actors, memorialization can create civic spaces for discussion of the past, can develop strong symbols supporting and reinforcing democratic values, can foster national self-respect based on human rights, can help heal wounds and animosities that threaten the future, and can teach democratic citizenship.

Governments therefore need to work out a *memorialization strategy* in dialogue with stakeholders. Success in designing and implementing a strategy requires close cooperation and mutual understanding among victims' groups, human rights groups, democracy-oriented NGOs and think-tanks, artists, designers, government institutions, and local government agencies, and others. It requires creative partnership among a variety of different sectors, including education, human rights, economic development, public welfare, tourism, and others. If memorialization is to be democratic it must be plural and inclusive, incorporating many voices. Dialogue must be based on solid ethical principles of mutual esteem and respect for human rights.

Civil society groups will often be skeptical and distrustful of government motives. And they should be. Governments logically seek to control the narratives of public memory, and they are therefore likely to develop those narratives in ways that suit not only government in general, but the specific government in power.[14] But in partnership with diverse actors governments bring important and valuable resources, including centrally placed and symbolically important land, funding, access to expertise, and convening power. In addition they can offer histories the status of "official" narratives.

Government can play the role of mediator among conflicting groups, developing national projects that synthesize or bring together a wide range of experiences. In this sense government can promote broader and longer-term interests than projects driven by specific local communities. But government must also negotiate the short-term political pressures of having to demonstrate specific, and often artificial, measures of progress, such as getting a monument constructed or achieving consensus on a national narrative for school curricula, during their term in office. This time pressure can undermine effective memorialization by curtailing participation and oversimplifying historical narratives.

Civil Society

Effective memorialization strategies will include equal (or greater) leadership from civil society. In many contexts civil society has provided the most energy and innovation for memorialization. NGOs generally have much more trust from a broader section of society. They are the only ones that can mobilize victims' groups and have the greatest or only access to the evidence—whether oral testimonies or documentary evidence—of what happened in the past. Free of the specific political mandates that encumber government, they can create more complicated, inclusive narratives that invite greater participation and debate.

Civil society can bring key resources to the discussion about how to remember the past. Victims' associations can bring testimony and the voices of their constituents; documentation centers can bring factual information about the events that occurred; and women's groups can bring a necessary gender perspective, to name a few.

In the final analysis, however, the most important point is that without the assistance—and especially the support—of civil society partners, state-run public memorialization efforts are likely to fail. This is because state-based efforts are always likely to be viewed with some suspicion, as discussed in the preceding section.

In some cases civil society actors may be better suited than the government to organize public memorial efforts. In

[14] See Norkunas, *Monuments and Memory: History and Representation in Lowell, Massachusetts.*

a country still mired in conflict or fresh out of one, or where the original perpetrators are still in power, a state-led initiative may raise questions about its evenhandedness and neutrality with respect to different parties to the conflict. But this does not mean that civil society efforts will necessarily be accepted. After all, in terms of their overall legitimacy civil-society memorial efforts have simultaneously the advantage and disadvantage of being unofficial, and thus may not be able to present a narrative on which different sectors of society can substantially agree.[15]

On the one hand numerous civil-society efforts represent the true multiplicity of memory narratives, belying the myth that a unified or single national narrative about the past is a desirable—or even possible—outcome. On the other hand representations of multiple memory narratives can also demonstrate an overly fragmented memoryscape in which there is no societal consensus about how to remember certain aspects of the past. This can frustrate efforts by governments that want to emphasize certain shared values and choose memorial forms to do so.

Linking Memorialization to Broader Transitional Justice Strategies

One clear message from the conference was that the creation of memorials or the preservation of memory sites should never be at the expense of truth and justice. That is, the temptation may exist to subsume broader transitional justice issues in a memorial. The government may be tempted to claim that by dedicating space and funding to constructing a memorial, it has "done enough" about the past.

There will always be serious concerns about dealing with the past that memorials cannot address directly. Memorials alone are unlikely to satisfy the demands and needs of those who suffered most, not to mention broader social questions of how societies come to grips with past trauma and abuse. Victims' associations and human rights groups demand that societies think about multiple strategies for dealing with the past. These demands are strongly supported by international law, which requires states to address past human rights abuse through a series of approaches including prosecuting the perpetrators, seeking truth about what happened, establishing reparations programs, and pursuing guarantees of nonrepetition though institutional reform.

At the same time memorialization can support a wide range of transitional justice and democracy-building measures. Too often confined to the category of symbolic reparations, memorialization projects can gather evidence for use in prosecutions, build public support for prosecutions, create new spaces for democratic engagement in divided communities, and foster a commitment to human rights in new generations. To fulfill its potential in this regard, though, memorialization must be integrated into overall transitional justice strategies.

The creation of memorials or the preservation of memory sites should never be at the expense of truth and justice.

Defining Accountability for Memorials as Democratic Institutions

Memorial projects, such as Sites of Conscience that seek to support larger goals of social reconstruction, are ideally places of civic engagement that can become central institutions of a thriving and stable democracy. Any national or international standards for memorialization should therefore reflect similar criteria for democracy in each context. For instance, they should be characterized by transparency, inclusiveness, public participation, truthfulness, responsiveness, and other criteria.

[15] This is similar to "unofficial truth projects" which, like some public memorials, are driven by civil society actors. See "Unofficial Truth Projects," *Human Rights Quarterly* 29 no. 4 (2007): 994–1035.

Setting standards of accountability for inclusiveness and public participation was important to conference participants. This point is especially important when public memorials claim to represent the experiences and claims of victims. Almost every memorial project faced critical debates about whose stories should be represented and how. Some sites were developed without consulting the very victims "represented" there. More often, a small and specific group of victims was consulted while many others were excluded by gender, race, religion, role in the conflict, or other characteristic. Public memorials ought to respond to questions of identity and inclusion, especially regarding gender. As places of democratic engagement, public memorials must create a space for diverse stakeholders to continually debate and expand who is part of the victim community before, during, and after the memorial's construction. If governments are in a rush to construct something in the name of victims, they may commit an egregious error by not incorporating victims in the creation and programming of the site.

Process as Goal

The temptation of governments and others to move quickly to create a public memorial is very common for a variety of reasons. Sometimes making a final product is satisfying and politically important; sometimes funding is only available during a certain period; sometimes victims and others grow impatient, wanting to see the finished site sooner rather than later.

However, participants discussed the proposition that the process of creating a memory site can itself be vital for social remembering and dealing with the past. That is, debating and discussing the form and content of representations of the past can itself be a worthy goal. In fact, focusing on the process—especially by prioritizing inclusion, participation, and public debate—can have multiple benefits.

That said, *don't rush* does not mean don't act at all. A process that produces nothing can frustrate everyone involved. Instead, memorial projects can develop organically and incrementally through intensive public participation and debate. Many of the most effective memorials were designed to be continually recreated and revised over time through interaction with visitors.

Do Memorials Create Forgetting?

Memorials should be about remembering, not forgetting: connecting past, present, and future.

This may seem obvious. However, some memorial designs in some political contexts can have the paradoxical purpose of *forgetting* the past.[16] Once a memorial is built, the responsibility to remember begins to fade. Although this problem was only indirectly addressed at the conference, participants felt strongly that memorialization should be deeply linked to social remembering.

Some memorial designs in some political contexts can have the paradoxical purpose of *forgetting* the past.

Sites of Conscience resist closing debate about the past. In fact, they are often likely to open debate. Ideally they do so in constructive, creative ways that develop thoughtful societal conversations about the relationships between past, present, and future. Public memorials can help visitors draw connections between the history the memorial remembers and related crimes and problems happening today, either in the same country or, perhaps, in other contexts. Past atrocities and cruelties should not be crystallized and located safely in the past but recalled as a continuing possibility in the present.

Participants did not have in mind the image of a forgotten statue that pigeons sit on but passersby ignore—what Nietzsche called "antiquarian history," in which the past is cut off from the present and seen as a quaint and distant time that has no relevance to the current moment. On the contrary, participants wanted to see vibrant, creative, color-

[16] This is perhaps most clearly examined in James E. Young's book, *The Texture of Memory* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995).

ful (literally or figuratively) public memorials and Sites of Conscience characterized by energy, human interaction, and active experiential learning.

Perhaps one of the most important recommendations to come from the conference is to keep in mind that the reason we create public memorials and Sites of Conscience is as much about the future as it is about the past. In other words, if the goal is to remember the past, we remember the past to build a better present and future.

This has enormous implications in terms of every aspect of memorial design—from conceptualization to design to the long-term plan for use and maintenance. For example, participants felt that in many cases (keeping in mind questions of appropriate behavior at places that have sacred or spiritual significance), sites should be used as locations for public events and activities. Organizers of public memorials should engage in active programming, such as educational activities.

Celebrating Resistance

Some participants argued strongly that people promoting memorialization projects ought to consider ways to affirm positive human rights action. Social movements that have struggled against evil in all its forms ought to be celebrated and remembered.

Participants noted that more memorials or museums should be dedicated to the struggle for human rights and the human beings dedicated to that cause at the national or international level.

One specific idea was to create memorials or museums that tell the story of the human rights movement of the Southern Cone of Latin America, which in some ways represents the genesis of the global human rights movement we know today.

Dialogic, not Didactic, Approaches

Memorials and memory sites need to inform, teach, or commemorate, but they also should raise questions and inspire introspection, thoughtfulness, and dialogue. In designing memorials, then, we must look not only at what we are communicating, but how. We must not only communicate new information but create new spaces and new ways of engaging with that information. Participants felt that the strongest examples of public memorials were those that integrated dialogic approaches—creating incentives for people to ask "why" questions, to interrogate their own assumptions, and to engage with diverse people.

The dialogue provoked by public memorials should be inclusive and plural. These initiatives should raise open-ended questions and create spaces for visitors to question one another. Such questions could include "What would you do in this situation?" "Where is this happening today?" "What do we need to do to prevent this from happening again?" They should aim to create experiences that help create better citizens.

Involving New Generations

Memorials are as much a reflection of the moment they are built as of the period they are supposed to represent. So what happens with the next generations? What happens when they lose interest?

Participants mentioned at least two ways to involve new generations. The first is by incorporating them in memorialization: asking the opinions of youth in the creation of memorials and involving them as key stakeholders. Memorials that celebrate the memory of a particular political or generational group tend to become frozen in time and lose their appeal to the young.

A second way to invite new generations into discussions about the past is through design. An interactive, questioning approach was considered the best way of involving young people in memory issues.

Art

Memorialization is a creative process in which artists can play an important role. They can develop innovative and fresh ideas about how to represent the past. Purely representational and traditional monuments are not the only ones to pose aesthetic and design questions; so do those that try

to provoke conceptual or philosophical debate and engage the spectator emotionally.[17]

However, these efforts are not purely artistic, and they should not be left to artists. On the contrary, artists should be asked to provide their ideas at the behest of organizers and creators of public memorials. At the same time victims' associations and human rights groups should overcome their reticence to involve artists in memory projects and open them to competition by artists and designers. The question of who has the final say in deciding on the aesthetics of public memorials is not obvious—it may or may not be artists, depending on the processes that are put in place. The equally important question is how the process of design has been constituted to include multiple voices and constituents.

Tourism

Attracting foreign visitors to memory sites has already become an important source of funding in some countries. In principle, sites should be open to all, and background information and explanations given in terms understandable to an international public. Memorials can help inspire a new commitment to human rights in foreign tourists, and they can take it back to their countries of origin. As one participant noted, some of the most important events, such as the Letelier trial or the arrest of Pinochet in London, took place abroad.

Tourism, however, needs to be regulated to preserve the integrity of memory sites and not to detract from or trivialize their message. The specter of "disneyfication" of sites haunted some participants; even more people worried about commercializing sites in ways that would be counterproductive to their initial goals.

Exchanges and Practical Workshops for Practitioners

Participants called for more models, lessons, manuals or practical guides, and opportunities for workshops and exchanges on the practical questions involved in developing memorials that promote cultures of democracy. Topics of such resources could include designing education programs, tourism management, managing stakeholder collaboration, and evaluating impact.

Research

Finally, the conference showed the wealth of diverse experience that should be taken into account; we need to do much more comparative research. We have a great deal to learn from and about these remarkable places. People have invested so much in them—whether because they are directly affected by the violence, or because they seek to create a better world through creative forms of public education. The truth is that there is much we do not know. The direct relationship between public memorialization about past atrocity, on the one hand, and the creation of peaceful, stable, meaningful democracies, on the other, is far from clear. The conference made only a small step toward understanding the complicated causal linkages.

In addition to more theoretical and conceptual research, we also need more practical and applied research. A great deal more remains to be learned about comparative experiences in design, creation, construction, and programming of these sites and projects.

[17] See Ksenija Bilbija, Jo Ellen Fair, Cynthia E. Milton, and Leigh A. Payne, eds., *The Art of Truth-Telling about Authoritarian Rule* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2005).

APPENDIX 1

About the Organizers

FLACSO–Chile www.flacso.cl

The Latin American School of Social Sciences, FLACSO, is an academic, regional, and autonomous international institution created in 1957 by the governments of Latin America and the Caribbean with the support of UNESCO. Its purposes are to promote teaching of and research on social sciences throughout the region and to contribute to the development and integration of the hemisphere.

Between 1957 and 1973 FLACSO had one office located in Santiago, Chile. During that period it created postgraduate schools in sociology and political science. As of 1973 FLACSO's General Assembly established a decentralized structure in Latin America, resulting in the creation of today's offices in Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Costa Rica, Cuba, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Mexico, and the Dominican Republic. The secretary- general's office is in San José, Costa Rica.

After almost half a century FLACSO–Chile has become a key actor in the field of social sciences in Chile and the rest of the hemisphere. Some of its teachers and researchers, such as Ricardo Lagos, José M. Insulza, Julieta Kirkwood, Fernando Henrique Cardoso, Norbert Lechner, and others, have moved on to positions of leadership in the region.

Emphasizing the importance of respecting human rights, FLACSO's mission is to contribute to the development of Latin American and Caribbean countries by promoting conditions of equity, democracy, and cooperation among nations. This mission is fulfilled through the creation and dissemination of knowledge and educational programs that uphold the highest standards of academic excellence in the social sciences.

International Center for Transitional Justice www.ictj.org

The International Center for Transitional Justice (ICTJ) assists countries pursuing accountability for past mass atrocity or human rights abuse. The Center works in societies emerging from repressive rule or armed conflict, as well as in established democracies where historical injustices or systemic abuse remain unresolved.

In order to promote justice, peace, and reconciliation, government officials and nongovernmental advocates are likely to

consider a variety of transitional justice approaches including both judicial and nonjudicial responses to human rights crimes. The ICTJ assists in the development of integrated, comprehensive, and localized approaches to transitional justice comprising five key elements: prosecuting perpetrators, documenting and acknowledging violations through nonjudicial means such as truth commissions, reforming abusive institutions, providing reparations to victims, and facilitating reconciliation processes.

The Center is committed to building local capacity and generally strengthening the emerging field of transitional justice, and works closely with organizations and experts around the world to do so. By working in the field through local languages, the ICTJ provides comparative information, legal and policy analysis, documentation, and strategic research to justice and truth-seeking institutions, nongovernmental organizations, governments and others.

The ICTJ's Memory, Museums, and Memorials (MMM) program is dedicated to exploring how societies use physical representations of the past and public art to confront the past. The MMM program is active in Bosnia, Cambodia, Morocco, and numerous other countries around the world.

International Coalition of Historic Site Museums of Conscience

www.sitesofconscience.org

The International Coalition of Historic Site Museums of Conscience fights for every community's right to preserve places of past struggle for democracy, to talk openly about what happened there, and to confront the contemporary legacies associated with those events. The Coalition constitutes the only training and exchange community dedicated specifically to developing new methodologies for using places of memory to inspire dialogue and action on contemporary human rights issues.

The Coalition was founded in 1999, when the District Six Museum (South Africa); Gulag Museum (Russia); Liberation War Museum (Bangladesh); Lower East Side Tenement Museum (USA) Maison des Esclaves (Senegal); National Park Service (USA); Memoria Abierta (Argentina); Terezín Memorial (Czech Republic); and the Workhouse (UK) made the following commitment: "It is the obligation of historic sites to assist the public in drawing connections between the history of our sites and their contemporary implications. We view stimulating dialogue on pressing social issues and promoting humanitarian and democratic values as a primary function." In Chile the Coalition is represented by the Villa Grimaldi Peace Park Corporation.

The Coalition's growing network of sites around the world now works to:

- Provide financial and technical support for innovative programs at Sites of Conscience that stimulate public dialogues on pressing social issues;
- Launch regional networks of sites in Africa, Asia, Russia, and South America addressing parallel histories and contemporary questions;
- Coordinate learning exchanges among member sites, from one-to-one collaborations to large conferences;
- Document and disseminate best practices from sites working in diverse contexts;
- Promote sites and their issues through a variety of media.

APPENDIX 2

Panel Participants, "Memorialization and Democracy" Conference, Santiago, Chile, June 2007

Martin Abregú (moderator) is representative of the Andean Region and Southern Cone office, Ford Foundation, Chile.

Sarwar Ali (moderator) is a trustee of the Liberation War Museum, Bangladesh.

Paige Arthur (moderator) is deputy director of research at the International Center for Transitional Justice.

Nadia Baiesi (speaker) is the director of the Monte Sole Peace School, Italy.

Louis Bickford (conference co-organizer), is the director of the Memory, Museums, and Memorials (MMM) program at the International Center for Transitional Justice.

Sebastian Brett (rapporteur) is Human Rights Watch's Santiago-based researcher, Chile.

Laurence Konmla Bropleh (speaker) is minister of Information, Culture, and Tourism, Liberia.

Ralph Buchenhorst (speaker) is a visiting professor at the Faculty for Philosophy and Literature at the University of Buenos Aires, Argentina.

Annie E. Coombes (speaker) is professor of material and visual culture in the School of History of Art, Film and Visual Media at Birkbeck College, University of London, UK.

Cristián Correa (conference co-organizer) is a senior associate at the International Center for Transitional Justice.

Romy Schmidt Crnosija (speaker) is minister of Public Lands, Chile.

Claudio Fuentes (speaker) is director of FLACSO-Chile.

Manuel Antonio Garretón Merino (speaker), is head professor in the Sociology Department of the Social Science faculty of the University of Chile.

Roberto Garretón (speaker) is a Chilean human rights lawyer and formerly the special rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Democratic Republic of Congo and former representative of the UN High Commissioner of Human Rights for Latin America and the Caribbean.

María José Guembe (speaker) is under-secretary of human rights for the City of Buenos Aires, Argentina.

Ahmad Fahim Hakim (speaker) is deputy chairman to the Afghanistan Independent Human Rights Commission (AIHRC), Afghanistan.

Katherine Hite (moderator) is a professor of political science and the director of the Latin American and Latino/a Studies Program at Vassar College in Poughkeepsie, New York, USA.

Bernard Khoury (speaker) is principal of an independent architectural practice in Beirut, Lebanon.

Alberto van Klaveren (speaker) is vice-minister of Foreign Affairs, Chile.

Sergei Kovalyov (speaker) is a trustee of the Gulag Museum at Perm–36 and the Memorial Society, Russia.

Wally Kunstmann (speaker) represents the Agrupación Metropolitana de ex-Presos Políticos, Chile.

Reinhard Maiworm (moderator) is co-director of the Goethe-Institute Santiago, Chile.

María Raquel Mejías (speaker) executive secretary of the Human Rights Program of the Ministry of the Interior, Chile.

Abdelhay Moudden (speaker) is professor of political science and international relations at Mohamed V University in Rabat, Morocco.

Lika Mutal (speaker) an artist who created and developed "El Ojo que Llora," an interactive artwork in memory of the victims of the 1980-2000 terror years in Peru.

Ereshnee Naidu (rapporteur) is senior educationalist and researcher working on symbolic reparations and living memory at the Center for the Study of Violence and Reconciliation, South Africa.

Vasuki Nesiah (moderator) is director of the Gender Program of the International Center for Transitional Justice.

Rosario Narváez Vargas (speaker) is a documentary filmmaker and board member of the Association for Human Rights (APRODEH), Peru.

Leigh Payne (moderator) is professor of political science at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, USA.

Darryl Petersen (speaker) is the site manager at Constitution Hill, South Africa.

Sibylle Quack (speaker) is the current Max Weber Chair at New York University's Center for European Studies, USA.

Judith Said (speaker) is the general coordinator of the National Memory Archive of the Office of Human Rights, Ministry of Justice and Human Rights, Argentina.

María Luisa Sepulveda (speaker) is presidential advisor for human rights, Chile.

Marcela Ríos Tobar (conference co-organizer) is officer of the Governance Program of the United Nations Development Program in Santiago, Chile.

Margarita Romero (speaker) is vice-president of the Board of the Villa Grimaldi Peace Park Corporation, Chile.

Maggie Russell-Ciardi (rapporteur) is a consultant for the International Coalition of Historic Site Museums of Conscience.

Debra L. Schultz (moderator) is director of programs for the Open Society Institute's Network Women's Program, USA.

Liz Ševčenko (conference co-organizer) is founding director of the International Coalition of Historic Site Museums of Conscience.

Victor Shmyrov (speaker) is director of the Gulag Museum at Perm–36, Russia.

Brigitte Sion (rapporteur) is a Ph.D. candidate in performance studies at New York University, USA.

Yasmin Louise Sooka (speaker) is the executive director of the Foundation for Human Rights, South Africa.

Héctor Timerman (moderator) is consul general of Argentina in New York, USA.

Patricia Valdez (speaker) is director of Memoria Abierta, Argentina.

Alexander Wilde (speaker) is senior research fellow at the Center for Ethics of the Jesuit Alberto Hurtado University, Chile.

Gabriela Zuñiga (speaker) represents the Agrupación de Familiares de Detenidos Desaparecidos (AFDD), Chile.

The Latin American School of Social Sciences (FLACSO), is an academic, regional, and autonomous international institution created in 1957 by the governments of Latin America and the Caribbean with the support of UNESCO. Its purposes are to promote teaching of and research on social sciences throughout the region and to contribute to the development and integration of the hemisphere.

The International Center for Transitional Justice (ICTJ) assists countries pursuing accountability for past mass atrocity or human rights abuse. The Center works in societies emerging from repressive rule or armed conflict, as well as in established democracies where historical injustices or systemic abuse remain unresolved. To learn more about the ICTJ, please visit www.ictj.org.

The International Coalition of Historic Site Museums of Conscience (www.sitesofconscience.org) is a worldwide network of "Sites of Conscience" – historic sites specifically dedicated to remembering past struggles for justice and addressing their contemporary legacies. The Coalition provides member sites with direct funding for civic engagement programs; organizes learning exchanges ranging from one-on-one collaborations to international conferences; and conducts strategic advocacy for sites and the Sites of Conscience movement. Today, the Coalition is led by 17 Sites of Conscience and includes more than 150 members and 1,800 supporters in 90 countries.

FLACSO
CHILE

international center for
TRANSITIONAL
JUSTICE

International Coalition
of Historic Site Museums of
Conscience