

ONLINE ISSN 1752-7724
PRINT ISSN 1752-7716

The International Journal of
Transitional Justice

www.ijtj.oxfordjournals.org



Editors-in-Chief:
Hugo van der Merwe
Harvey M Weinstein

Managing Editor:
Nahla Valji

Volume 4 • Issue 3 • November 2010

Special Issue: Transitional Justice
on Trial - Evaluating Its Impact
Guest Editor: Colleen Duggan



OXFORD JOURNALS
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

The International Journal of Transitional Justice

Editors-in-Chief

Hugo van der Merwe (South Africa)
Harvey M. Weinstein (USA)

Managing Editor

Nahla Valji (South Africa)

Assistant Editor

Jasmina Brankovic (South Africa)

Editorial Board

Mohammed Abu-Nimer (USA)
David Backer (USA)
Erin Baines (Canada)
Christine Bell (Northern Ireland)
Youk Chhang (Cambodia)
Pablo de Greiff (USA)
Elizabeth Jelin (Argentina)
Elizabeth Lira (Chile)
Brinton Lykes (USA)

Martha Minow (USA)
Ahmad Nader Nadery (Afghanistan)
Moses Okello (Uganda)
Rosalind Shaw (USA)
Graeme Simpson (USA)
Yasmin Sooka (South Africa)
Eric Stover (USA)
Ruti Teitel (USA)
Leslie Vinjamuri (UK)

International Advisory Board

Abdullah An-Naim (USA)
M. Cherif Bassiouni (USA)
Sonja Biserko (Serbia)
Ariel Dorfman (USA)
Susan Dwyer (USA)
Maurice Eisenbruch (Australia)
Basil Fernando (Hong Kong)
Richard Goldstone (South Africa)
E. Gyimah-Boadi (Ghana)
William Haglund (USA)
Zainab Hawa Bangura (Liberia)
Luc Huyse (Belgium)

Natasa Kandic (Serbia)
Neil Kritz (USA)
Helen Mack (Guatemala)
Jaime Malamud-Goti (Argentina)
Mahmood Mamdani (USA)
Rita Manchanda (Nepal)
Rama Mani (France)
Juan Mendez (USA)
Adèle Kirsten (South Africa)
Abdelhay Moudden (Morocco)
Ken Roth (USA)
Richard Wilson (USA)



Acknowledgement

This Special Issue was supported by the generous funding of the Compton Foundation. We would like to thank Oryx Media for providing us with the SA TRC photograph that appears on the front cover.



This journal is a member of and subscribes to the principles of the Committee on Publication Ethics.

The International Journal of Transitional Justice

Volume 4 Number 3 2010

Special Issue: Transitional Justice on Trial - Evaluating
Its Impact

Guest Editor: Colleen Duggan

www.ijtj.oxfordjournals.org

Contents

Editorial Note <i>Colleen Duggan</i>	315
Articles	
State-Level Effects of Transitional Justice: What Do We Know? <i>Oskar N.T. Thoms, James Ron and Roland Paris</i>	329
Impact Assessment, Not Evaluation: Defining a Limited Role for Positivism in the Study of Transitional Justice <i>Geoff Dancy</i>	355
Cambodians' Support for the Rule of Law on the Eve of the Khmer Rouge Trials <i>James L. Gibson, Jeffrey Sonis and Sokhom Hean</i>	377
Utopian Dreams or Practical Possibilities? The Challenges of Evaluating the Impact of Memorialization in Societies in Transition <i>Brandon Hamber, Liz Ševčenko and Ereshnee Naidu</i>	397
Outreach Evaluation: The International Criminal Court in the Central African Republic <i>Patrick Vinck and Phuong N. Pham</i>	421

Continued overleaf

Please visit the journal's website at:
www.ijtj.oxfordjournals.org

Contents continued . . .

Watching a Bargain Unravel? A Panel Study of Victims' Attitudes about Transitional Justice in Cape Town, South Africa <i>David Backer</i>	443
When Truth Commissions Improve Human Rights <i>Tricia D. Olsen, Leigh A. Payne, Andrew G. Reiter and Eric Wiebelhaus-Brahm</i>	457
Assessing Local Experiences of Truth-Telling in Sierra Leone: Getting to 'Why' through a Qualitative Case Study Analysis <i>Gearoid Millar</i>	477
Notes from the Field African Transitional Justice Research Network: Critical Reflections on a Peer Learning Process <i>Nokukhanya Mncwabe</i>	497
Book Reviews Megan Shore, <i>Religion and Conflict Resolution: Christianity and South Africa's Truth and Reconciliation Commission</i> Antjie Krog, Nosisi Mpolweni and Kopano Ratele, <i>There Was This Goat: Investigating the Truth and Reconciliation Commission Testimony of Notrose Nobomvu Konile</i> François du Bois and Antje du Bois-Pedain (eds.), <i>Justice and Reconciliation in Post-Apartheid South Africa</i> Ole Bubenzer, <i>Post-TRC Prosecutions in South Africa: Accountability for Political Crimes after the Truth and Reconciliation Commission's Amnesty Process</i> (By Cyril Adonis)	509
Books Received	519

Utopian Dreams or Practical Possibilities? The Challenges of Evaluating the Impact of Memorialization in Societies in Transition

Brandon Hamber,* Liz Ševčenko† and Ereshnee Naidu**

Abstract

For countries rebuilding in the wake of violence and repression, memorials, museums and places of memory represent a critical terrain where the past is confronted and conflict can be addressed. Memorialization, however, has not always been as intentional and strategic as other transitional justice practices, and evaluation of its impact is limited. This article focuses on the work of the International Coalition of Sites of Conscience and an evaluation of the youth programs of three of its members: the Liberation War Museum in Bangladesh, the Monte Sole Peace School in Italy and the Villa Grimaldi Peace Park in Chile. The evaluation found that the sites had a number of impacts on the young people who visited them, including changing opinions, raising awareness, improving relationships, encouraging civic engagement and increasing emotional understanding of the human consequences of atrocity. The article questions how such impacts relate to wider social processes (for example, human rights reform, violence prevention and transitional justice) and how social and political processes affect the potential for individual and group impacts. It argues that transitional processes can make better use of the specific resources memorial sites have to offer.

Introduction

For countries rebuilding in the wake of violence and repression, memorials, museums and places of memory represent a critical terrain where the past is confronted and conflict can be addressed. Across vastly different contexts, citizens in societies emerging from conflict have demanded memorialization as necessary to moving forward. Some Rwandans refused to bury their dead until their suffering was adequately recognized;¹ Argentineans waged a 30-year campaign for justice

* Director, International Conflict Research Institute (INCORE), University of Ulster, Northern Ireland. Email: b.hamber@ulster.ac.uk

† Founding Director, International Coalition of Sites of Conscience, USA. Email: lsevcenko@sitesofconscience.org

** PhD candidate, City University of New York, USA. Email: ereshn@yahoo.co.uk

¹ Susan E. Cook, 'The Politics of Preservation in Rwanda,' in *Genocide in Cambodia and Rwanda: New Perspectives*, ed. Susan E. Cook (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 2005); Sara Guyer, 'Rwanda's Bones,' *Boundary* 36(2) (2009): 155–175.

through demands for remembering the disappeared;² and spontaneous memorials sprouted on street corners in New York City following 9/11. Recently, survivors of the Liberian conflict called for that country's Truth and Reconciliation Commission to recommend local and national memorial sites that recognize victims of the conflict. This became one of the first recommendations in the TRC report.

Memorialization – the various processes and forms of collective remembrance³ – is a process fundamental to recovering from trauma and atrocity. Of the many ways of addressing the past that make up transitional justice, such as prosecutions, truth commissions and institutional reform, memorialization can involve larger numbers of people over long periods of time and be initiated equally by communities and governments.

But memorialization has not always been as intentional and strategic as other transitional justice practices. States and civil society often do not have the choice of *whether* to engage in memorialization because the process is spontaneous and sometimes linked to wider political demands of different groups during the transition, as in the Liberian case. They do, however, have the choice of *how*. This is a critical choice, as memorialization holds both risk and promise for societies in transition. Memory and history are almost always highly contested. This contestation can be used to undermine reconciliation within, between and among nations, and can be both helpful and harmful to victims of political violence, depending on how it is used.⁴ Failure to pay attention to the dynamics surrounding memorialization, both official and informal, could undermine other transitional justice efforts,⁵ and peace more generally. But it is precisely the deep investment in sites of memory from every level of society, and the contested nature of those sites, that can be a powerful catalyst for productive new dialogue and public engagement.

Exactly how memorialization supports social reconstruction or transitional justice is not well documented. Particularly in postconflict societies where extensive human rights violations have taken place, there can be a tendency to focus on commemorating the dead at sites of atrocity, with little consideration of the site's long-term utility. Sabine Marschall argues, for example, that South Africa has experienced a 'flurry of activity in establishing new commemorative monuments, memorials and statues . . . [*but*] it may surprise one that there is still very little critical debate around this practice.'⁶

At the same time, transitional justice practitioners are increasingly calling for memorialization as integral to larger democracy-building strategies. The

² Sam Ferguson, 'The Unending War: Argentina's Quest for Justice,' *Boston Review*, 22 July 2008.

³ Judy Barsalou and Victoria Baxter, *The Urge to Remember: The Role of Memorials in Social Reconstruction and Transitional Justice* (Washington, DC: US Institute of Peace, January 2007).

⁴ *Ibid.*; Brandon Hamber, 'Narrowing the Micro and Macro: A Psychological Perspective on Reparations in Societies in Transition,' in *The Handbook of Reparations*, ed. Pablo de Greiff (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006); Brandon Hamber, *Transforming Societies after Political Violence: Truth, Reconciliation and Mental Health* (New York: Springer, 2009).

⁵ Barsalou and Baxter, *supra* n 3.

⁶ Sabine Marschall, 'Visualizing Memories: The Hector Pieterse Memorial in Soweto,' *Visual Anthropology* 19(2) (2006): 147 (emphasis added).

International Center for Transitional Justice now describes memorialization as ‘an important component of a holistic transitional justice approach.’⁷ The truth commissions of South Africa, Ghana and Peru, among others, recommended the development of memorials to ensure lasting reform. While guidelines have been created for many other aspects of reform in times of transition (for example, establishing truth commissions), no commensurate tools are available for effective memorialization programs.

To this end, the article explores memorialization in the transitional justice field through an evaluative lens. It focuses on the work of the International Coalition of Sites of Conscience, a network of places of memory that use their histories to open dialogue on contemporary human rights issues.⁸ The article seeks to contribute to thinking about the role of memorialization in transitional justice and to the theory, tools and resources necessary to evaluate memorialization practice.

The article begins by outlining some of the key debates and literature on evaluating transitional justice, memorialization, peace education and museums, as key components to the debate about the role of memorialization and allied processes (for example, youth education through museums) in transitional justice. Thereafter, it explores the specific interventions the Coalition seeks to make in these debates through three case studies of member sites: the Liberation War Museum in Bangladesh, the Monte Sole Peace School in Italy and the Villa Grimaldi Peace Park in Chile.⁹ It uses the case studies to suggest strategies for addressing some of the challenges to conceptualizing and evaluating the impact of memorialization.

Evaluating Memorialization

Transitional Justice and Memorialization

Evaluation of transitional justice mechanisms and all their components is in its infancy. This is particularly true for memorialization. For example, if one analyzes the reports of a range of truth commissions, memorialization and conflict-oriented museums are clearly advocated,¹⁰ but exactly what contribution they can make is seldom expressed. Equally, memorial museums are spoken about by those who run them as having profound educational benefits and as being instrumental in preventing human rights violations, but exactly how they do this is generally not articulated. A range of aspirations, as expressed by the often-heard statement, ‘learning about the past will prevent the violence from reoccurring,’ are common in memorialization projects that use the mantra, ‘Never Again.’ The popular

⁷ See, the International Center for Transitional Justice’s Memory, Memorials and Museums Program, <http://www.ictj.org/en/tj/785.html> (accessed 24 August 2010).

⁸ The Coalition is currently made up of 17 accredited Sites of Conscience and more than 100 individual and institutional members from around the world (<http://www.sitesofconscience.org/en/>).

⁹ We would like to thank all those who participated in the study, as well as the staff at the sites who assisted in developing and implementing the research process. We are indebted to all.

¹⁰ Louis Bickford, Aaron Weah and Tal Avivi, *Integrating Memory into the TRC’s Final Report: Paper Submitted to the Liberian Truth and Reconciliation Commission* (Unpublished report, International Center for Transitional Justice).

assumption that publicizing 'great suffering carries in its wake deep moral knowledge'¹¹ and can engender acknowledgment and collective responsibility¹² has firmly taken root in transitional justice debates, as well as in the memorialization field.

However, further examination of truth commission reports reveals that most do not actually recommend the process that needs to be undertaken at sites of memory for them to achieve some of the outcomes they promise. Memorial sites cannot, through their mere existence, achieve reconciliation, violence prevention or respect for human rights. It is only through careful design, innovative programming and evaluation, as well as through linking such processes to other wider mechanisms (for example, wider institutional human rights reform or justice processes), that sites can materially contribute to these long-term goals. As Judy Barsalou and Victoria Baxter conclude:

[Memorial sites are] evolving, long-term social, economic, cultural, and political processes that are difficult to measure. Assessing the impact of memorials and museums is possible, but doing so requires careful planning, investment of resources, and willingness to track changes over time. Understanding what effect a memorial project has on promoting social reconstruction also requires being clear up front about the goals the project is trying to achieve.¹³

The current framework transitional justice scholars and practitioners use for memorialization is limited. It largely confines memorials to the category of symbolic reparations¹⁴ and to recommendations in truth commission reports for the establishment of memorials.¹⁵ Memorials and memory sites are often treated as finite objects or goods; analysis generally ends when the memorial is built or after its first few years of existence, leaving insufficient understanding of how communities experience the site over time. These analyses can be limited to the people directly involved in the conflict and the process of remembering it, excluding audiences such as young people and others with no experience of the memorialized events.

The literature on the role of memory in contemporary political conflicts and debates is growing,¹⁶ but it does not include formal impact assessments of memorials. Some studies have been done on the impact of different educational processes

¹¹ Laurence M. Thomas, 'Suffering as a Moral Beacon: Blacks and Jews,' in *The Americanization of the Holocaust*, ed. Hilene Flanzbaum (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999), 204.

¹² Michael Humphrey, *The Politics of Atrocity and Reconciliation: From Terror to Trauma* (London: Routledge, 2002).

¹³ Barsalou and Baxter, *supra* n 3 at 3.

¹⁴ Hamber, 'Narrowing the Micro and Macro,' *supra* n 4; Brandon Hamber and Ingrid Palmay, 'Gender, Memorialization, and Symbolic Reparations,' in *The Gender of Reparations: Unsettling Sexual Hierarchies while Redressing Human Rights Violations*, ed. Ruth Rubio-Marín (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009).

¹⁵ Bickford, Weah and Avivi, *supra* n 10.

¹⁶ Andreas Huyssen, *Present Pasts: Urban Palimpsests and the Politics of Memory* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2003); Edward T. Linenthal, *Preserving Memory: The Struggle to Create America's Holocaust Museum*, 2nd ed. (New York: Columbia University Press, 2001); Paul Williams, *Memorial Museums: The Global Rush to Commemorate Atrocities* (New York: Berg, 2007); James E. Young, *The Texture of Memory: Holocaust Memorials and Meaning* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1993).

that use memorialization or the memory of atrocity with young people.¹⁷ That said, this is still a developing field.

Peace Education

In the education field, research has been conducted on various pedagogies, including 'peace education,' 'citizenship training' and 'human rights education,' relying on curricula aimed at educating young people about the dangers of prejudice, xenophobia, abuse of power or racism. New comparative research has begun to analyze different states' reform of history curricula and pedagogies, and that reform's impact on the states' larger efforts to confront, and move on from, the past.¹⁸ Whether leading or following these national reform efforts, many memorial sites include youth education programs that seek to inspire a human rights consciousness by encouraging critical reflection and debate.

Peace education includes programs concerned with changing attitudes, increasing tolerance, weakening stereotypes and changing conceptions of the self and of the 'other.'¹⁹ The specific field of peace education, however, is widely defined.²⁰ Many different types of peace education programs are available, making their evaluation difficult and our ability to generalize about them limited. Some focus on educating a homogeneous group of young people about human rights values and principles of peace, others focus on bringing together individuals from diverse communities and backgrounds in joint activities to learn about such processes together, and still others aim at getting different communities into direct dialogue (considered to be more about intercommunity dialogue than peace education as such). These dialogues may or may not take place at memorial sites or in relation to certain events.

Although more data is needed to confirm the long-term effects of such programs,²¹ after reviewing a number of programs in countries in conflict or emerging from conflict, Gavriel Salomon concludes that peace education programs do positively change the attitudes and perceptions of those who attend them, and that they certainly do not cause a deterioration in attitudes.²² A review

¹⁷ Paula Cowan and Henry Maitles, 'Does Addressing Prejudice and Discrimination through Holocaust Education Produce Better Citizens?' *Educational Review* 59(2) (2007): 115–130; Gavriel Salomon, 'Does Peace Education Make a Difference in the Context of an Intractable Conflict?' *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology* 10(3) (2004): 257–274.

¹⁸ Elizabeth A. Cole, 'Transitional Justice and the Reform of History Education,' *International Journal of Transitional Justice* 1(1) (2007): 115–137.

¹⁹ Daniel Bar-Tal, 'The Elusive Nature of Peace Education,' in *Peace Education: The Concept, Principles, and Practices around the World*, ed. Gavriel Salomon and Baruch Nevo (Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 2002); Ake Bjerstedt, *Peace Education: A World Perspective for the 1990s* (Malmo, Sweden: School of Education, 1995); 'Declaration and Programme of Action on a Culture of Peace,' UN Doc. A/RES/53/243 (6 October 1999).

²⁰ Zvi Bekerman and Claire McGlynn, eds., *Addressing Ethnic Conflict through Peace Education: International Perspectives* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007); Ian M. Harris and Mary Lee Morrison, *Peace Education*, 2nd ed. (Jefferson, NC: McFarland and Co., 2003); Gavriel Salomon and Baruch Nevo, eds., *Peace Education: The Concept, Principles, and Practices around the World* (Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 2002). See also, the *Journal of Peace Education*.

²¹ Salomon, supra n 17.

²² Ibid.

of the literature by Paula Cowan and Henry Maitles concludes that, for example, Holocaust education can have a positive impact on the outlook of young people.²³ Previous research in secondary schools provides evidence that Holocaust education can help develop an awareness of human rights and issues like genocide, stereotyping and scapegoating, and increase students' general political literacy.²⁴ Facing History and Ourselves (FHAO), a pioneer in teaching young people about citizenship and human rights through the Holocaust and other atrocities, has undertaken a number of evaluations of its work. One evaluation found an increase in relationship maturity, a decrease in racist attitudes and a self-reported decrease in 'fighting behavior' relative to comparison students who did not attend the program.²⁵ Another concluded that FHAO engages

teachers, and increase[s] their efficacy in promoting their students' academic and civic learning. Students reported more positive classroom climates, and demonstrated greater historical understanding, and civic skills and dispositions than students in the control group.²⁶

Despite the variety of peace education programs, little research and evaluation accompanies such activities.²⁷ What data does exist is generally not longitudinal. A large review of Holocaust education also concludes that assessment of work in the area is still in its formative stages and largely based on anecdotal evidence, with much scientific research to be done.²⁸

Museums, Sites and Exhibits

The question facing museums aimed at remembering atrocities is what impact they have on their visitors' understanding of human rights today. Studies have outlined some of the potential benefits of visiting so-called 'authentic sites':

- A unique atmosphere that can create a special desire to learn and that evokes strong emotions;
- Opportunities for in-depth study of particular places and moments in time;
- Opportunities to study original artifacts that can stimulate interest, motivation and learning;

²³ Cowan and Maitles, *supra* n 17.

²⁴ *Ibid.*; Henry Maitles, Paula Cowan and Eamonn Butler, *Never Again! Does Holocaust Education Have an Effect on Pupils' Citizenship Values and Attitudes?* (Edinburgh: Scottish Executive Social Research, 2006).

²⁵ Lynn Hickey Schultz, Dennis J. Barr and Robert L. Selman, 'The Value of a Developmental Approach to Evaluating Character Development Programmes: An Outcome Study of Facing History and Ourselves,' *Journal of Moral Education* 30(1) (2001): 3–27.

²⁶ Facing History and Ourselves, *Improving Teacher Effectiveness, Student Academic Performance, and Civic Learning* (March 2010), 3.

²⁷ Salomon, *supra* n 17.

²⁸ Leora W. Isaacs, Wendy J. Rosov, Lauren Raff, Shira Rosenblatt, Shirah Hecht, Miri Rozenek and Zohar Rotem, *Best Practice in Holocaust Education: Report to the San Francisco Jewish Community Endowment Fund* (New York: Jewish Education Service of North America, 2006).

- A direct and tangible link with people in the past that is difficult to replicate in the classroom; and
- Opportunities not to answer historical questions but rather to serve as a stimulus for new historical, moral and ethical problems to be discussed.²⁹

Hava Schechter and Gavriel Salomon show that visits by Israeli youth to Auschwitz can increase young people's empathy toward Palestinians. However, that empathy tends to increase in those who already have a more favorable disposition toward Palestinians, and empathy decreases in those who have more negative perceptions beforehand.³⁰

Museum field evaluations typically analyze the design of the memorial – the choices of design, narrative, visitor path and so on – and the impact these specific choices make on visitors. They usually treat memorial sites as educational institutions and are concerned with measuring what specific information people learn from them, as well as what larger messages visitors 'take away' with them. Further, museum evaluation generally categorizes the people involved as 'visitors' or 'audience,' rather than as 'stakeholders' or 'participants,' creating a division between the people who design the museum and those who experience it.³¹ The focus is not on the interactions between people or on the experience of participating in the memorialization process, which are often the concern in transitional justice processes. The meaning, purpose and reception of any memorial site are also always changing and will be different for different visitors.³² Generally, museums do not attempt to measure their impact on their communities' larger social and political dynamics or on society as a whole (for example, does the museum contribute to peace, reconciliation or developing a societal human rights culture?). Wendy Stone argues that the social impact of museums' work is difficult to prove, and concludes that it is best to consider the contribution museums can make, rather than overstate their impact.³³

Although performance measurement is of growing importance in the museum field,³⁴ this activity is undertaken primarily in the US and Europe and is based on museum experiences in those regions. Museum evaluation is limited in developing countries.

²⁹ Task Force for International Cooperation on Holocaust Education, Remembrance and Research, *Recommendations for Study Tours to Holocaust-Related Sites*, <http://www.holocausttaskforce.org/education/guidelines-for-teaching/revi-sed-guidelines-on-visiting-holocaust-related-sites.html> (accessed 24 August 2010).

³⁰ Hava Shechter and Gavriel Salomon, 'Does Vicarious Experience of Suffering Affect Empathy for an Adversary? The Effects of Israelis Visits to Auschwitz on Their Empathy for Palestinians,' *Journal of Peace Education* 2(2) (2005): 125–138.

³¹ Randi Korn, 'Studying Your Visitors: Where to Begin,' *History News* 49(2) (1994): 23–26.

³² Marschall, *supra* n 6.

³³ Wendy Stone, cited in Lynda Kelly, 'Measuring the Impact of Museums on Their Communities: The Role of the 21st Century Museum' (paper presented at the 'New Roles and Missions for Museums' conference, Taipei, Taiwan, 2–4 November 2006).

³⁴ Carol Scott, 'Measuring Social Value,' in *Museums, Society, Inequality*, ed. Richard Sandell (London: Routledge, 2002).

Case Studies

This article draws from a study³⁵ developed by the International Coalition of Sites of Conscience, whose members distinguish themselves from other memorials or museums by making three specific commitments: (1) to interpret history through the site; (2) to stimulate dialogue on pressing social issues and promote democratic and humanitarian values; and (3) to share opportunities for public involvement in issues raised at the site. Through these commitments, the Sites of Conscience – each one in different ways in its unique context – seek to play an intentional role in the civic life of their societies. The study sought to identify the most promising common strategies across the sites in order to help memorial processes support social reconstruction in a wide variety of places around the world. The Coalition selected three of its more than 250 member sites for a pilot impact assessment: the Liberation War Museum in Bangladesh; the Peace School Foundation of Monte Sole in Italy; and Villa Grimaldi Peace Park in Chile. Aided by independent evaluators (two of this article's authors), staff carried out assessments of the participating sites. The sites were selected because they represent three radically different historical, cultural and political contexts. An examination of such disparate sites together could test whether there are indeed strategies, and methodologies for assessing them, that could usefully be applied across diverse Sites of Conscience. The evaluation was a pilot seeking to extract key ideas and the beginnings of a framework that could inform the Coalition's future evaluation work, rather than a definitive conclusion about the impact of each site.

The three sites undertake a wide variety of work, including gathering oral histories, guided tours, youth education and teacher training. To assess fully their wider social impact, one would have to analyze each of these activities separately. To focus this study, the sites decided to concentrate on assessing the activity on which each spends most energy and resources, and around which there were the most untested assumptions of impact on preventing future human rights abuse, that is, youth education programs. To this end, the assessments focused on two groups of stakeholders: youth directly participating in the programs and representatives of the institutions with which the site would have to connect in order to build a larger culture of peace, namely educators and nongovernmental organizations whose work would build the sites.

Identifying Key Indicators

During the design of the evaluations, about a dozen members of the Coalition, representing sites in diverse political and cultural contexts around the world, conducted a two-day workshop to discuss the common impacts they were trying to achieve and possible ways of recognizing those impacts. Comparing their wide range of experiences, the participants identified specific contributions they felt

³⁵ The study was funded by the US Institute of Peace.

Coalition sites were uniquely qualified to make at a societal level, and outlined related indicators that could be measured from a single visit. While many indicators were unique to each political and cultural context, the following were identified as being in common among the participants:

- **New information:** A site of conscience seeks to offer multiple perspectives on history and memory as tools for dismantling myths and exploring the diversities of ethnic or political identities. Did participants identify new perspectives on the past or on their relationship to others?
- **Change of opinions:** Did participants think differently about the contemporary issues the site raised as a result of their experience at the site? Did something they saw or heard change their mind about a specific policy or other question?
- **Emotional understanding of human consequences:** A site of conscience provides a visceral connection to the past. Did participants express empathy for the people they learned about at the site and make a human/emotional connection? Did they articulate new ideas about a group of people or become sensitized to something?
- **New relationships and collective conscience:** A site of conscience seeks to inspire dialogue and sharing of perspectives, create shared awareness of hidden aspects of the past and communicate a collective sense of social responsibility. Did the program build new communication among participants in the program? Did it create a new shared understanding of something?
- **Critical thinking and engagement:** A site of conscience seeks to provide citizens with a space for open debate and questioning, a one-day model of the kind of engagement it hopes to foster in the larger society over the long term. Did participants indicate that they felt free to express things they had not expressed in other forums? Did the program provoke participants to ask questions and engage in discussion with each other? Even a small doubt or question raised can be an indicator of new critical thinking.
- **New understanding of civic agency and personal responsibility:** A site of conscience seeks to inspire participants to act as a result of the visit. Did participants articulate an understanding of their personal potential and responsibility to support the construction of democracy?

To ensure that these outcomes were built on by other forces, the workshop participants recognized the need to measure

- **Integration with other social reconstruction institutions or processes:** Is the experience at the site effectively connected to/supporting other opportunities for democratic engagement and tolerance building? Is it integrated with the educational system? Does the site directly collaborate with or support other initiatives pursuing social reconstruction (for instance, truth commissions, judicial processes or police education)?

Methodology

Participating sites worked with Coalition staff and two of this article's authors to create three sets of qualitative research tools: focus groups, individual interviews and program observations. The tools, built around the indicators, included questions common across sites as well as specific to each site.³⁶

Between February and May 2009, evaluators undertook weeklong field visits to work with the three case study sites to develop further the questions and protocols, support each site in piloting the tools with its program and observe the program. Evaluators trained site staff on the use of the tools and co-facilitated focus groups or individual interviews with local staff to ensure that the tools could be utilized effectively beyond the initial evaluation. Each site conducted 10–12 individual interviews with key stakeholders, including trustees of the site, educators who have had a long-standing relationship with the site, government officials and volunteers. Five to seven focus groups were held with students between the ages of 12 and 16 and educators who participated in the sites' programs. The interviews were carried out largely within one month after visiting the sites and were therefore measuring short-term impact, although some of the teachers interviewed had brought their classes to the sites on several previous occasions.

Once all the data had been collected and translated into English, the evaluators analyzed the transcripts and extracted common themes and responses relating to the indicators outlined above. Evaluators also compiled and compared results from the observation protocols in relation to indicators and circulated them to site staff for comment. A larger report was circulated to the Coalition representatives who took part in the study for comment. Below is a summary of some of the key findings. As noted above, the study sought to provide sufficient information to chart a path for the Coalition's future evaluative endeavors.

Villa Grimaldi Peace Park, Chile

Founded in 1996, Villa Grimaldi Park for Peace Corporation strives to preserve the historical memory of Villa Grimaldi and other centers of torture and detention in Chile; to promote a culture of human rights; to develop programs and activities to achieve the above goals; and to manage, conserve and promote the peace park for the benefit of the community of Peñalolén.

Following the 1973 coup, soldiers from the National Intelligence Directorate (*Dirección de Inteligencia Nacional*, or DINA) appropriated Villa Grimaldi, the estate of a wealthy family, and transformed it into military intelligence offices. Villa Grimaldi became one of the epicenters of cruelty and violence of the military dictatorship. Approximately 4,500 political prisoners passed through the center, of whom four were executed and 226 went missing. As the dictatorship came to

³⁶ All research protocols were independently verified and assessed against a standard ethics protocol, receiving ethical approval via an independent party (Independent Review Consulting) contracted by the US Institute of Peace.

an end, military intelligence destroyed virtually the entire estate in an attempt to erase all evidence of its history.

The site has been reconstructed into a peace park with a variety of memorials and spaces for meeting and reflection. Colorful floor mosaics, created from pieces of pavement found at the site, are scattered throughout the park to commemorate the detainees, who were always blindfolded and sometimes only ever saw the ground. Wooden reconstructions of former solitary confinement and torture cells have been built to provide a physical sense of how basic human functions like standing, sitting or even sleeping would have been a struggle. A 'Wall of Names' presents engravings of the 226 people who disappeared at Villa Grimaldi, providing a space for contemplation. A room in which DINA generated false documents is now used to exhibit photographs and personal mementos collected and arranged by families of the site's victims. A rose garden commemorates all the women who were detained/disappeared and executed during the dictatorship.

Today, Villa Grimaldi conducts its work within a society that remains politically divided and ambivalent about the dictatorship. Villa Grimaldi staff are particularly concerned about what they perceive to be a decrease in civic participation among youth since the 1970s, as well as an increase in xenophobia, racism and bullying in schools usually attributed to a rise in immigration from neighboring countries in the 1990s that has transformed the school population.³⁷

Methodology

The main aims of Villa Grimaldi are to share the history of the site and other former centers of torture and detention in Chile and to encourage human rights awareness among youth. In keeping with these goals, the institution undertakes a variety of activities, including teacher training, collection of oral histories and commemorative/cultural events.

Villa Grimaldi seeks to use the power of the site and of personal testimony to draw on the human dimensions of the narratives of torture and detention. Facilitators seek to help students use the stories of what happened at the site to gain insight into the new challenges they experience and how to address them. For example, their youth programs analyze the 'logic of discrimination' and the 'axis of identity and othering' that structured repressive policies in the dictatorship, and ask youth to explore how that logic is being applied today and what consequences they see.³⁸

Program Evaluated

The evaluated program was a participatory tour of Villa Grimaldi. Tours are led by either a volunteer or a former detainee and consist of nine stops that are used to tell the history of the site and the period of political repression. The tour includes

³⁷ Villa Grimaldi Park for Peace Corporation, 'Diálogo con jóvenes: Qué significan los derechos humanos en mi contexto?' (unpublished grant proposal); Villa Grimaldi Park for Peace Corporation, 'Programa rutas pedagógicas y taller de diálogo ciudadano: Reflexiones con jóvenes sobre la discriminación para la democracia' (unpublished grant proposal).

³⁸ Villa Grimaldi Park for Peace Corporation, 'Programa rutas pedagógicas,' *supra* n 37, 5–6.

an interactive question-and-answer session with students. The target audience for the program is students from public and private schools in and around the Chilean capital, Santiago.

The tour begins with an explanation of what the site is and why the students are there, emphasizing everyone's right to know the history of their country. At one stop, students are invited to sit on a wall, nicknamed the 'Wall of Solidarity,' where prisoners once sat side by side for brief outdoor respites. This is a stop for reflection and debate, intended to establish links among the students and between the students and the people from the past they are learning about. Facilitators distribute a picture of a young prisoner wearing a student uniform, much like the ones students now wear, and hand-written letters narrating what happened at this site. Students participate by reading the letters aloud. The discussion focuses on questions of isolation, resistance and solidarity among the prisoners.

At the reconstructed water tower and former DINA documents building, the group inhabits physical structures from the past. During the observed tours, it was at these points that the students appeared most engaged. The tour ends at an exhibition of artifacts offering evidence of disappearances during the dictatorship, opening questions about cases that have still not been investigated. Contemporary issues around violence, terror and human rights are raised throughout the tour.

Responses

New information. Students stated that Villa Grimaldi offered them alternative perspectives to those shared within their family. One student noted, 'When I was a child my parents told me things very clearly. My family was affected by the dictatorship. But I didn't know . . . I got new information.' A teacher commented that the learning begun at the site lasted for many years after the visit:

I think that it is significant that to this day students that are in third grade and came here while in eighth grade primary still remember everything that happened, some of the stories. Last year when they were in eighth grade and talking about human rights in Chile, they remembered what they witnessed here. That shows significant learning.

Change of opinions. Overall, the program raised awareness of how the legacies of human rights abuse shape Chilean society today. A student commented,

Before going there I used to think one way about human rights. I thought that all rights were respected in Chile and when we went there I realized that it wasn't like that. There are many people who suffer discrimination and it shouldn't be like that.

Emotional understanding of human consequences. Teachers and students highlighted that the emotional impact of physically being at the site and hearing firsthand testimony contributes to the lasting impact of the information imparted there. A student noted,

The energies are strange here. To me it was like a step into history. To enter there and have the same feelings that were felt by the people who were tortured there . . . and even feel the same pain.

A teacher similarly commented,

The testimony of someone who was detained there is much more meaningful than a guided visit. Because there is a source there that is relating the facts, it's the person that lived here and lost friends. He was telling what specifically happened here for the students. This was very meaningful. There was an emotional charge there involved.

New relationships and collective conscience. Students could relate the legacies of violence to their own experiences in the present. Some perceived links between the current culture of violence among youth and bullying at school and remnants of violence from the Pinochet regime. One student said,

One is able to see how the violence still exists symbolically [today]. Violence and assaults exist but I believe it's because our parents are always working and they no longer have time to be with us. These facts affect us symbolically, [coming] more or less from the time of the dictatorship.

One teacher observed a decrease in violence in the classroom after the visit: 'I had a class that was very violent between them, especially verbally, and I have seen a positive change.' Another observed,

The school where I teach has high levels of violence – physical, verbal and psychological – between students and from students toward teachers. I think in some way Villa Grimaldi produces a change . . . in the area of respect for others.

Recommendations for Improvement

Evaluators observed that students tended to be disconnected during those parts of the tour disassociated from what they could see at the site, such as recreated buildings and displays of artifacts. Given the emotional impact of the program, both educators and students recommended that it would be useful for the tour to end with a discussion session to enable students to share the different emotions, as well as connections to contemporary issues, that the tour raised for them. Students who had participated in tours earlier in their school career expressed disappointment that there had been little follow-up from the site. Many suggested that Villa Grimaldi should do outreach to more schools and build in a follow-up project to ensure sustainability and ongoing youth engagement with issues of human rights and violence.

Liberation War Museum, Bangladesh

The Liberation War Museum was established in 1996 to commemorate the Bengali struggle for democracy and national rights. It seeks to build public memory as well as official recognition of the Pakistani Army's mass attacks on civilians in 1971 as genocide. According to the museum, between 25 March and 16 December 1971, more than three million Bengalis were killed, some 200,000 women raped and 10 million people displaced to neighboring India.³⁹ The museum traces the

³⁹ Liberation War Museum, 'Genocide and Atrocities,' <http://www.liberationwarmuseum.org/liberation-war/51-genocide-and-atrocities> (accessed 24 August 2010). Other estimates of the

resistance struggle and the emergence of Bangladesh as a democratic, secular nation-state.

The museum aims both to depict the history of the liberation war and to highlight questions of religious tolerance, peace and human rights in the country today. It places this work within the context of a rise in interreligious violence in the country, from major bomb attacks in the capital, Dhaka, to persecution of religious minorities in rural areas. The museum is also deeply involved in lobbying for investigations and prosecutions of war criminals, with the staff believing that a lack of accountability and justice has supported a culture of impunity that fosters interethnic and interreligious violence.

Methodology

The Liberation War Museum pursues four main strategies: targeting audiences in rural areas, where religious tensions are highest and awareness of human rights is lowest; opening multiple perspectives on the past by providing alternative narratives to those taught in schools; creating a physical space outside the classroom in which to foster more participatory and critical engagement; and inviting students to continue their engagement with others in their community through an oral history program.

The museum offers a significant alternative to the educational system in both content and pedagogy, as the liberation war is taught in only a limited way in schools and most of the information in the museum is inaccessible in Bangladeshi classrooms. The museum's narratives of the war present a different perspective than that in school textbooks, depicting the conflict as a struggle for pluralism, religious tolerance and secular democracy, and using the struggle to promote those values in Bangladesh today. As a result of ethnic and religious tensions in many regions of the country, the museum faces ongoing resistance from schools in areas that have not fully accepted secularism.

In addition to imparting new information about the democratic ideals of the founding of Bangladesh, the museum is attempting to model positive behaviors of secular democracy through its programs. This represents a different culture of learning from that cultivated in Bangladeshi classrooms, which has traditionally been based on central control and memorization of facts. Educators and other civil society groups are making an ongoing effort to introduce more participatory pedagogies into the country's educational system. In addition to introducing a new subject matter, then, the museum is part of a wider effort to promote educational reform, which it sees as critical for developing the democratic culture it seeks to promote.

violence during the period are also catalogued at Lionel Baixas, 'Thematic Chronology of Mass Violence in Pakistan, 1947–2007,' *Online Encyclopaedia of Mass Violence* (24 June 2008), <http://www.massviolence.org/Thematic-Chronology-of-Mass-Violence-in-Pakistan-1947-2007> (accessed 24 August 2010).

Program Evaluated

The museum's Mobile Museum is a minibus that travels to rural schools outside Dhaka, targeting youth aged 10–16 in areas that continue to be potential fault lines for religious violence and intolerance. The minibus holds a photo exhibition of the history of the liberation war. Museum staff and trustees travel with the exhibition, engaging students in a half-day program.

The program begins with an orientation and a screening of a documentary film on the war. This is followed by a tour of the Mobile Museum and viewing of a poster exhibition on the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The program concludes with a brief dialogue on issues of religious tolerance and human rights.

The program has extraordinary reach. Since 2001, 153,301 students from 478 schools in 25 districts of Bangladesh (out of 64) have experienced the program. The museum has developed a variety of follow-up activities to build an ongoing relationship with each school and support continuing discussion of the issues the on-site program raises. Perhaps most significant for the museum's support of larger transitional justice efforts is its oral history program, in which teachers work with students to interview family members or village elders about their experiences in 1971. In addition to opening conversations on a topic that has long been silenced in these rural communities, the interviews have led to the identification of previously unknown killing fields in remote areas, which has contributed to investigations that may lead to future prosecutions. The museum supports this growing collective memory by collecting and publishing select interviews, and by inviting students from various rural areas to Dhaka to read their essays on the war aloud during public events.

Further, the museum ensures that schools receive materials to display their own exhibitions on a permanent basis. Each school nominates one teacher to serve as an ongoing liaison with the museum, which organizes meetings for the teachers in Dhaka at least twice each year to evaluate the program and brainstorm on how to increase its impact. Between these meetings, the museum sends schools a 'wall magazine,' a sort of newsletter in poster form that informs readers about actions other schools are taking to promote the dialogues started by the Mobile Museum's visit.

Responses

New information. Several students commented that the new information they learned about the liberation war and the Declaration of Human Rights provoked new insights on contemporary realities. One noted, 'We now know about the liberation war. The knowledge will help [us] become conscious of the cost of freedom.' A teacher indicated that the Mobile Museum inspired a new awareness of the need for accountability: 'Now they have a stand against the war criminals as they have seen the cruelty of war and become aware about the role of the local war criminals.'

Change of opinion/emotional understanding of human consequences. Both the documentary and the exhibition explicitly represent the horror of the war. Many students expressed strong emotional reactions, with one saying, ‘It was good but we felt pain when we saw the documentary.’

New relationships and collective conscience. The program’s emotional impact inspired a range of conclusions about relationships among different sectors of society and ideas about values, some of which support and some of which threaten to undermine the goals of the museum. For one student, the sacrifice of the war created a shared experience and values for groups often in conflict: ‘Everyone sacrificed for the liberation war, no matter if they were male or female, rich or poor, Muslims or from other communities. We fought the war for freedom.’ For another, however, it inspired a sense of hatred against an ill-defined group of people, which is not a value the museum seeks to promote: ‘We hate all those that created the conflict.’

Critical thinking and engagement. Some teachers observed that the program served as a catalyst for further reflection and discussion: ‘Your program made [students] curious about issues. Moreover now they discuss the issue with each other from time to time.’ One teacher noted, ‘Questions are being raised and that is definitely a good sign.’

New understanding of civic agency. At the conclusion of the Mobile Museum visit, educators invite youth to interview elders in their community about their experiences of the liberation war, to write an essay reflecting on what the oral histories suggest for human rights and tolerance in Bangladesh today and to send the essay to the museum. Students have collected about 12,000 oral histories. The program aims to encourage learning between different generations as well as preserve the fading memory of the war. It also solicits information about the location and stories of unexcavated killing fields in local communities, building a body of evidence for future prosecutions.

Recommendations for Improvement

Students and teachers alike suggested increasing the time for dialogue. A student commented, ‘The program will be more effective if we get more time to discuss.’ A teacher noted, ‘The only problem was time. The students could only see the bus and the posters at a glance and there was no time to discuss the issues.’ Both groups also recommended that the museum conduct follow-up activities and develop deeper relationships with the educational system. One teacher suggested,

For long-lasting impact, inclusion of the issues into the curriculum is a must. You should take several teams with students from the school in that area who will work countrywide to conscientize the masses of people.

A student observed, ‘Your program was one time. There is a possibility that we will forget the issues within a short period . . . so inclusion in the curriculum is the best way.’

Peace School Foundation of Monte Sole, Italy

The Peace School Foundation of Monte Sole, outside Bologna, remembers the massacre of villagers by Nazi troops and Italian Fascist forces on 29 September and 5 October 1944 as part of a terror campaign to suppress Partisan resistance. Up to 770 people, mostly women and children, were killed. Now converted into a nature park, this quiet and peaceful landscape pays testament to the terrible violence done to civilian populations in this region during the war.

The rising tide of violence and discrimination toward migrants and minorities in Europe, as well as the rise of extreme right-wing parties, is a staff concern. They feel this challenges the establishment of a Europe that embraces principles of freedom, equality and human rights. Teachers report a rise in incidence of prejudice in the classroom against Roma and immigrants from Africa and South Asia in particular. The school promotes

training and peace education projects, non-violent transformation of conflicts, respect for human rights and peaceful coexistence among different people and cultures, and a society without xenophobia, racism and any other kind of violence towards human beings and their environment.⁴⁰

Methodology

The school seeks to encourage critical thinking by helping young people question their certainties and challenge stereotypes. Its strategy focuses on structured, participatory dialogue among students that connects the stories of the site to contemporary issues. The school does not rely on a standardized program, often meeting with teachers to design visits to meet their specific needs. Sessions, however, generally include icebreakers and cooperative activities that foster relationships among participants, as well as dialogue in groups.

Facilitators focus on multiple rather than master narratives. They want to impart a complex view of history, not the view that all perpetrators are ‘monsters,’ all Partisans were heroes and victims are without resistance and agency. Facilitators encourage participants to go beyond sympathizing with the victims to understand their own potential to do harm under certain conditions, believing that peace is built through engaging with hard questions about how violence happens, not just through condemning it. To this end, facilitators aim to ‘break the certainties’ participants have about themselves, including the idea that they would not harm others under any circumstances.

Program Evaluated

The target audience is 13- and 16-year-old Italian youth. The program centers around a two- to three-hour tour to the sites where some of the 1944 massacres took place, located some 3 kilometers from the school, where the trip begins. The

⁴⁰ International Coalition of Sites of Conscience, ‘Peace School Foundation of Monte Sole,’ <http://www.sitesofconscience.org/sites/monte-sole/en/> (accessed 24 August 2010).

history of the sites is communicated through direct reference to the environment. The facilitator begins by asking about the area today and why it is not populated. S/he asks the participants what they know about the area and goes from there, building on participants' existing knowledge rather than lecturing them.

The tour proceeds to three different ruin sites, where scant remains can be seen of what were private homes and shops, a church and a cemetery. The facilitator explains how the massacres took place in each place, what strategies villagers used to try to survive, what methods soldiers used to trap them, how villagers were ultimately killed and how any survivors escaped. The narration often includes emotional oral testimony delivered by a survivor and two others that are read aloud by the facilitator.

At the same time, the facilitator introduces some morally complex stories and invites dialogue among participants on the questions these stories raise. For example, s/he tells the story of an Italian Partisan who wounded a Nazi soldier during the conflict and decided to leave him there alive. Another Partisan arrives and argues that it is safer to kill the Nazi. Under pressure, the Partisan kills the Nazi. The facilitator asks participants to reflect on the case and the question of choice in such circumstances.

This lays the groundwork for some of the discussions that happen back at the school after the tour. There, facilitators focus on helping students draw connections between what they experienced on the tour with questions and conflicts they face in their lives today, such as racist violence and stereotyping, xenophobia, propaganda and the struggle to stand up to these pressures.

Responses

Change of opinions. Some participants expressed new perspectives on stereotypes, with one student noting,

A time ago I thought a person was a certain way only because he came from a specific country . . . Nothing could change my ideas. Instead, right now, I understand when I am in front of a person . . . maybe I knew that person and I don't feel to think negatively about him.

Emotional understanding of human consequences. Teachers and students both indicated that the strong emotional impact of the site itself helped them become more aware about the past and acquire knowledge in a lasting way. A teacher said that the experience was not simply 'intellectual' but rather created learning through 'identification.' Some expressed an awareness of the humanity and individuality of both victims and perpetrators, and grappled with what this implied for how such violence could take place. A student observed,

I think that the main topic we thought about was the difference between the victims and the perpetrators. I thought about it because they both were human beings. So I asked myself what difference exists between those who were killed and who kill.

Critical thinking and engagement. Several students noted that the school's dialogue format opened a space for expression and engagement that did not exist in

the classroom. They felt ‘free to express’ their views, as one student noted:

We had the possibility to break some barriers among us, to feel comfortable . . . to reach important discussions . . . The facilitators didn’t act as teachers or authorities, but we decided together. Then sometimes, during the activities, they let us continue the discussion and observed us without intervening; so we almost forgot their presence and felt free to express what we think about.

New relationships and collective conscience. Some students commented that the site inspired a ‘cohesion of the group’ and a change in dynamics within their own group/class, which included young people both from Italy and from minority groups. One said,

Monte Sole is a different context, so . . . dynamics are really different from what normally happens in the class. We are a class with a difficult story, and last year we had many divisions among us. [The program] gave us the possibility to reevaluate our relationships with people . . . You needed to abandon any prejudice [toward classmates] because you needed to collaborate to gain good results in the activities.

New understanding of civic agency and responsibility. Some students could analyze the individual choices made by the actors in Monte Sole’s history, and could use those to consider their own agency and responsibility. One student noted,

One beautiful and simple message . . . is the fact that these soldiers obeyed orders passively, they did not think about their fellow human beings . . . Learn to understand where evil and good are in each one of us, in each group, and try to think with your head!

Recommendations for Improvement

The element of the Peace School’s program that had the greatest impact – lengthy engagement with the site and in-depth, open dialogue on the mechanics of violence – is also the most time consuming and resource intensive. It requires multiple staff who can dedicate an entire day (sometimes days) to one group of students. As a result, the school serves a small number of students in comparison with other Coalition members. However, the example suggests that the sites that invest resources in such deep programming meet more of their objectives than those offering a shorter and more passive experience. Greater human resources are required to promote real attitudinal change and to support other social reconstruction efforts.

Impact, Memorialization and Transitional Justice

The sites that were evaluated have a strong emotional impact and, certainly in the short term, cause some students to reevaluate their own views on a range of issues (for example, the nature of historic events and protagonists in them or attitudes to certain groups and individuals). They raise awareness about specific events, and experiential learning at authentic sites creates (according to a number of students) a more lasting impression than classroom-based education, which relates facts to

students via lectures or teacher input. As one student put it, visiting the site ‘was like a step into history.’ Almost all the teachers who took students to the sites reported that relationships within classes improved as a result of the visits. Several teachers and students in the Villa Grimaldi case study went as far as to suggest that violent behavior among and between students decreased. That said, while it could be the content of the site visits that improves relationships in the classroom, any observed changes could also simply be linked to the change in dynamics caused by a field visit. Teachers’ anecdotal examples, certainly in the Monte Sole case, suggest that the discussions students have about difference (often between themselves and their own backgrounds) positively affect classroom relationships. This, however, seemed to be observed more by teachers who had involved students in ongoing programs at Monte Sole and afterwards at the Peace School.

Students, teachers and site staff did agree that long-term engagement is needed and that programs with follow-up plans produce better results. This finding highlights the challenge of distinguishing short-term and long-term goals in evaluating memorialization processes. In the long term, the International Coalition of Sites of Conscience seeks to foster a lasting culture of human rights, in which citizens take responsibility for promoting human rights in their communities, which forms a strong bulwark against future abuse. In the past, many Sites of Conscience found that both internal and outside evaluators made the mistake of using long-term indicators to assess a short-term experience; for instance, measuring the impact of a single hour-long visit to a site based on whether students’ violent behavior immediately decreased. This mismatch of indicators to impact led to false conclusions that, in some cases, a site has no impact and, in others, larger impact can be achieved by the very existence of the site. In both cases, the specific strategy of a site and its specific impact were left unanalyzed.

In the case studies described here, short-term impact can be demonstrated (for example, learning new information, a change of opinions and the emotional impact of the visit), as indicators were geared toward a realistic assessment of what could be achieved, but the larger connection to wider processes and longer-term impacts remains a challenge. Self-reporting of impact, especially concerning attitudinal change, and most notably when a site has emotional content, can also be unreliable. That said, the participant observation component of the study did confirm that, in the first instance, visitors tended to be engaged by the visit, took in new information and spoke about how it changed their views about issues and certain groups.

Nonetheless, caution is necessary with regard to saying how lasting any impact may be. Any single visit to a site of conscience, in the view of the Coalition, is one critical building block in the larger project of social reconstruction or the transitional justice landscape. The Coalition’s long-term vision can only be achieved through close collaboration with different institutions and projects from a range of sectors. The key question for participating sites, then, concerns the most effective outcome they can achieve during a single youth program aimed at laying a strong foundation for supporting other key institutions, such as schools, human

rights reform or legal processes. The problem is that the assertion that these small building blocks, on their own or in an interrelated way, can lead to macro social change has not been unequivocally established in terms of individual transitional justice mechanisms more broadly, let alone at the level of single programs at memorial sites. On one level, being able to show that a program increases awareness, improves relationships and impacts on attitudinal change should be satisfactory in itself; however, during times of transition, the relevance of specific institutions, especially if their content is political, lies in their ability to effect wider social impact. Why else would a truth commission report recommend establishing a memorial project?

Although helping victims deal with difficult memories is often a stated goal of memorial projects, wider goals, such as prevention of future violations, are generally assumed, too. Although we can try and talk down the realism of such goals, they permeate the aspirations of both the creators of memorial sites and those the sites commemorate. The challenge is not only to differentiate long-term from short-term goals but also to understand the relationship between them and their relationship to other factors that hinder and promote their attainment.

To that end, long-term goals need to be articulated as explicitly and with as much precision as short-term goals. Different sites articulate their larger goals as building cultures of peace, democracy, social reconstruction, social change or human rights. In societies in transition, what we mean by any of these terms can be overly determined by political circumstances and contested. For example, at a macro political level, peace can be promoted at the expense of justice (for example, the amnesties granted in South Africa, Chile and Uganda), but those advocating for a peace education program might seek to promote the need for justice with little respect for compromises agreed upon by politicians in the name of political peace.

A further example is the issue of how memorials deal with the narrative they put forward. Some are highly dismissive of any attempts to convey a meta narrative,⁴¹ arguing that sites should strive to be inclusive spaces for dialogue from multiple perspectives, in which ideas can be contested in an ongoing way, building critical thinking and popular cultures of democracy. Many sites avoid presenting one narrative, instead prioritizing critical thinking and debate. The Peace School Foundation of Monte Sole takes this approach, focusing on a range of different players in the conflict, although of course grounding this in a condemnation of the Nazis and their actions. However, multiple narratives can also fragment the 'memorialscape,' leaving no societal consensus about how to remember aspects of the past. This can undermine efforts to develop certain shared values.⁴²

As a result, some museum practitioners feel that although museums might present events from multiple perspectives, they should be clear about where they

⁴¹ Peter Novick, *The Holocaust and Collective Memory* (London: Bloomsbury, 2001).

⁴² Sebastian Brett, Louis Bickford, Liz Ševčenko and Marcela Rios, 'Memorialization and Democracy: State Policy and Civic Action' (report of the conference, 'Memorialization and Democracy: State Policy and Civic Action,' Santiago, Chile, 20–22 June 2007).

stand on the issues those events raise (for example, discrimination against minority groups) in order to inspire more critical thinking about why they occurred.⁴³ It may be necessary to adopt a standpoint on some issues, argues Richard Sandell, because research suggests that this does not stop visitors from having their own opinions. In this context, museums should not merely present multiple views, they should frame conversations about difference.⁴⁴ Others contend that democracy cannot exist without justice based on a single incontrovertible truth, and that dialogue on the past can expose hard-won facts to corruption and denial and degenerate into an all-permissive moral relativism.⁴⁵ They argue that a generally agreed-upon frame of reference is needed 'to communicate and negotiate conflicting memories.'⁴⁶

That said, multiple narratives, even if considered only a frame of reference, often do not sit easily at a political level in societies in transition, as they may seem to threaten the macro goals of some transitional justice processes (for example, reconciliation and justice). Transitions can give rise to the impulse to develop a new national identity and narrative to assist in reconciling the population.⁴⁷ Many memorialization efforts are about authenticating nation,⁴⁸ and specific messages emanating from memorialization can be part of this process. Although 'moral projects' (such as those that impart new values) can be countergovernmental, writes Fiona Cameron, they are often ultimately mobilized by governments to serve political ends or for economic advantage.⁴⁹ In societies in transition, this can be observed as happening in two ways. First, some societies emerging from conflict demonstrate an overwhelming desire to bring the population together. Such societies tend to try and create a new national identity that subsumes different identities instead of highlighting diversity out of the fear that such processes could exacerbate tensions. Take, for example, the oft-heard phrase in Rwanda, 'We are all Rwandans now.' Such a drive for a new national identity can mask multiple narratives and identities. In South Africa, the push toward a new national identity through mechanisms such as the Truth and Reconciliation Commission has been critiqued for creating, at times, a false sense of reconciliation.⁵⁰ Historic sites have sometimes been part of this project, by presenting an image of a unified and reconciled society.

Second, memorial sites can be used to force a specific ideology onto society. For those in power, memorialization is often used as a political resource to maintain

⁴³ Richard Sandell, 'Taking a Stand,' *Museums Journal* 106(4) (2006): 18–21.

⁴⁴ Ibid.

⁴⁵ Brett et al., supra n 42.

⁴⁶ Aleida Assmann, 'Response to Peter Novick,' *GHI Bulletin* 40 (2007): 38.

⁴⁷ Elizabeth M. Crooke, *Museums and Community: Ideas, Issues and Challenges* (London: Routledge, 2007).

⁴⁸ Ibid.

⁴⁹ Fiona Cameron, 'Safe Places for Unsafe Ideas? History and Science Museums, Hot Topics and Moral Predicaments,' *Social History in Museums: Journal of the Social History Curators Group* 32 (2008): 5–16.

⁵⁰ Brandon Hamber and Richard A. Wilson, 'Symbolic Closure through Memory, Reparation and Revenge in Post-Conflict Societies,' *Journal of Human Rights* 1(1) (2002): 35–53.

control or legitimize their position.⁵¹ Sites can become more about glorification than memorialization, seeking to legitimize governing ideologies.⁵² At the community level, meanwhile, many memorials can be described, in the words of Kris Brown, as sectional museums.⁵³ Such museums seek to put across one communal or political point of view, are generally didactic and engage the visitor in a moralistic way that reinforces the sense of the museum community's victimhood. In such a museum, there is little room for debate or alternative interpretations,⁵⁴ and providing multiple narratives to humanize former enemies is anathema. But, such museums can also be important counterhegemonic forces, established to challenge dominant state narratives.

Conclusion

Much thinking remains to be done about how we evaluate memorialization in societies in transition, on both the local/immediate and the societal/long-term level. One option is to evaluate the direct outcomes of the work of memorial sites (for example, whether they change attitudes or increase awareness) – the focus of the case studies presented here. But questions of how successfully meeting program-level goals supports wider societal processes such as building a human rights culture or ensuring justice must ultimately be addressed. Specifically, the case studies here left evaluators asking where memorialization fits in the transitional justice panoply, and what contribution successful programs that take place at the group or individual level can make to the broader goals of transitional justice.

The Coalition members, when developing the indicators for the study, recognized the need to measure 'integration with other social reconstruction institutions or processes' in future studies. The initial evaluation gave some potential direction to future studies. One lesson is that ongoing engagement, such as continued classroom activities after site visits, might produce more in-depth learning (as reported by teacher interviewees). The relationship to wider processes, such as police education, national curriculum development or judicial processes, however, would require much more in the way of resources than is available to the majority of memorial sites. With current levels of funding, sites do not have the capacity to run intensive programs with young people (over the long term and with multiple contacts with each visitor, as the evaluation suggests), engage in broader societal and political activities to link their work to other mechanisms and undertake longitudinal studies of the impact of such activities.

How can this situation be addressed? Can we develop models that would yield multifaceted and interdependent contributions? How can these models be

⁵¹ J.E. Tunbridge and G.J. Ashworth, *Dissonant Heritage: Managing the Past as a Resource in Conflict* (Chichester: John Wiley, 1996).

⁵² *Ibid.*

⁵³ Kris Brown, 'Living with History: Conflict, Commemoration and Exhibitions in Northern Ireland – The Case of Sectional Displays,' *Social History in Museums: Journal of the Social History Curators Group* 32 (2008): 31–38.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*

practically useful and not distorted within rapidly changing and politically charged societies in transition? The case studies presented in this article suggest that memorialization and allied initiatives can have an impact on individuals and groups, but that to exploit this potential fully at the macro and micro levels, four additional processes should be considered.

First, the impact of memorial sites needs to be maximized through long-term investment, ongoing programs and accompanying evaluation. However, the longer the period under evaluation, the more difficult it is to attribute change to the memorial sites, because more time means a greater range of social, political and other influences. Sophisticated, long-term evaluation is required that not only uses output-driven quantification (for example, how many people visited a site and attitudes before and after a visit using control groups) but also follows, for instance, a cohort of young people over time, focusing on how their attitudes are formed and shaped through multiple interactions and factors.

Second, other transitional justice mechanisms (for example, truth commissions and judicial processes) need to articulate in their goals and activities how different processes (say, a recommendation for curriculum development in a truth commission or an ongoing youth education project at a memorial site) might relate to one another in practical and theoretical ways to increase impact, and not simply in cumulative or complementary terms. Those working in memorialization need to do the same, but the flow of analysis has to be bidirectional.

Third, if we take the more modest view that memorial projects should focus on individual and group change in attitudes, relationships and behavior, and that practitioners should link their activities to other social processes, such as educational or police reform, then the call is for different initiatives and wider transitional processes to make better use of the specific resources memorial sites have to offer. The evaluation challenge would then be to help different initiatives form the most constructive relationships given their limited resources. To meet this challenge, the field must reflect on value-laden ideas of what a successful transition looks like, including how best to deal with the question of meta versus multiple narratives and narratives that might be counter to the dominant trajectory of the transition (for example, a focus on victim demands for justice in a context where amnesty has been granted).

Finally, empirical work needs to be undertaken that helps develop a theoretical model that outlines how the kinds of micro change that memorial sites effect can influence the wider goals of transitional justice, as well as how the broader social context can reciprocally enhance, or limit, what can be achieved at individual sites.