ENTRENCHED INTRANSIGENCE OR EMANCIPATED ENLIGHTENMENT? BUILDING OR DESTROYING SOMETHING WITHIN THE SPOTLIGHT OF CONFLICT

Sandy Jarrouje[1], Shu-Ling Lu and Martin Sexton

School of Construction Management and Engineering, University of Reading, Whiteknights, Reading, RG6 6AH, UK

Buildings are places of safety and conflict. When shells cracked the horizon and my world in my country of Syria, I sought cultural heritage buildings (CHBs) for quietness and security. I am now understanding that these very buildings are caldrons of entrenched memories, and negotiation spaces of future settlements or, perhaps, of unease. The buildings are not limited to cultural heritage - rather they expand to cultural futures. They have a distinctive agency that emanates from their deep context and history. This paper revisits the literature on CHBs from its cosy moorings of preservation and conservation. We offer a warzone perspective. An ambiguous hinterland where CHBs become the catalyst of simmering grievance that implicate and dictate future conflict or reconciliation. Through a prism of unfolding autoethnography of the lead researcher's experience of the recent Syrian war, the literature review traces boundaries, asserting the need to explore the social and personal questions beckoning with CHBs, and the trauma of the sudden shift from more entrenched rules in stable times towards unprecedented rules (chaos?) conditioned by war. This paper will contribute to an inside-out perspective to the meanings of CHBs in warzones and gives possible future direction.

Keywords: autoethnography, conflict, cultural heritage buildings, memory, war

INTRODUCTION

The concept of cultural heritage (CH) can give cultural, social and political illumination (Blake, 2000). And, though, often opaqueness. CH is often seen as an overarching (nebulous?) concept, whether 'tangibles' such as movable items like sculptures and paintings, as well as immovable monuments, buildings, and sites (Salvatore, 2018); or 'intangibles', for example, rituals, indigenous knowledge, and abilities that have been associated with communities and are sovereign to their identity (Kim *et al.,* 2019). Our societies are witness to conflict and war, and cultural heritage buildings (CHBs) are often left in rubble - either as collateral damage or targeted intent. Countries like The Syrian Arab Republic (hereafter Syria), The Republic of Iraq (hereafter Iraq), and Ukraine are ongoing examples of the impact of war on their peoples and CHBs. The prevailing literature tends to focus on CHBs in stable and peaceful environments (Nanetti, 2021) rather than in fragile environments exemplified by warzones (Lababidi and Qassar, 2016). Furthermore, even the limited studies

[1] s.jarrouje@pgr.reading.ac.uk

Jarrouje, S, Lu, S-L and Sexton, M (2024) Entrenched Intransigence or Emancipated Enlightenment? Building or Destroying Something within the Spotlight of Conflict *In:* Thomson, C and Neilson, C J (Eds) *Proceedings of the 40th Annual ARCOM Conference,* 2-4 September 2024, London, UK, Association of Researchers in Construction Management, 519-528.

looking from a warzone perspective of CHBs are still strangled by their focus on technical approaches (Johannot-Gradis, 2015; Kila and Zeidler, 2013), with little consideration towards the social sphere of within which CHBs are an interwoven part. Neither there is an adequate appreciation of the sudden shift from entrenched rules in stable times towards unprecedented rules dictated by wars. As the anthropologist Smith (1998, 205) argues "[w]ars are without equal as the time-markers of society. Lives are so irrevocably changed that culture and behaviour are marked by three phases: "before the war", "during the war", and "after the war". Understanding the severity of the implications of war on societies is central to understanding the change between the two notions of CHBs found in stable environments and in warzones. Price *et al.,* (2007) claimed the emotional dimensions of the immediate demands to restore damaged CHBs in most post-wars scenarios is a strong psychological need amongst societies to restore the familiar. But who's 'familiar' is left elusive and unclaimed. Whilst the Price-type arguments go part way in justifying the literature's tendency to focus on restoration and rehabilitation of CHBs in warzones, they fail to expose the negligence to be found in not studying the social and personal meaning and significance of CHBs in warzones: "if you want to obliterate a population it's not just about subjugating people (or worse atrocities) you have to do away with each person's essence which of course isn't something you're born with but develops in a surrounding. To say someone is separate from his [sic.] surrounding is illusory" (Sexton, R. 2024, personal correspondence).

Previous studies on CHBs in warzones can be generally grouped into three interests: studying the level of damage occurred to CHBs in warzones and their causes (Danti *et al.,* 2017); documenting the original features of threatened CHBs for future restoration if required (Silver *et al.,* 2016); and, examining the conservation and rehabilitation processes of CHBs (Sabri *et al.,* 2023). Whilst these insights are useful to protect and conserve CHBs in warzones, they are not sufficient to secure a coherent perspective on the social and personal dimensions. Therefore, this paper ushers an inside-out perspective to the meanings afforded to CHBs in warzones, through providing the start of an autoethnographic journey of lead researcher's personal experiences during the Syrian war of 2011, which describes the meaning of CHBs throughout and after wars, and the implications on personal and the societal levels. The fellow authors are travellers and stewards of reflection in the lead author's quest for understanding. The creation of co-produced narrative between the lead author and fellow authors followed Kempster and Steward's work (2010) who conducted a co-constructed autoethnography of situated learning of leadership practice.

Autoethnography is understood to be "a form of self-narrative that places the self within a social context. It is both a method and a text" (Reed-Danahay, 1997, 9). Butz and Besio (2009, 1) further explained autoethnography as "authors scrutinise, publicise, and reflexively rework their own self-understandings to shape understandings of and in the wider world. As such, autoethnographies are necessarily trans-cultural communications, articulated in relation to self and a wider social field that includes an audience of others". The methodology and method vision helps in making sense of the lead author's search for meaning of CHBs in warzones.

This paper is organised as follows. First, a vignette of the lead researcher's personal experience of the recent Syrian war is offered. It is not given as a generalisation, far more importantly, it stretches out to readers who determine if the story speaks to them about their life or that of others they know. Second, the concept of CHBs is

examined. Third, CHBs in warzones is explored throughout the lenses of technical approaches and social aspects. Finally, an agency of CHBs in warzones is proposed.

The Lead Researcher's Personal Experience of the Recent Syrian War

In September 2013, I was stunned to know that Maaloula, the village where I used to camp, party, and work was taken by Al-Qaeda linked jihadist group called Al-Nusra Front, which invaded the village, killed people, and destroyed most of its cultural heritage buildings. The village where I once shared my laughs and tears had changed forever. Maaloula to the rest of the world is viewed as an ancient city with thousands of years of history. To me, it is the source of countless memories and a part of my identity. The village is known as one of the most important Christian sites in the Middle East. Its people still speak Aramaic which is believed to be the language of Jesus Christ. Maaloula is listed on the tentative lists of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO), and it contains several churches, caves, and monasteries with extremely valuable icons. The main two monasteries are the monastery of Saint Sergius and the monastery of Saint Takla. These two monasteries have historical parallel about their creations. The monastery of Saint Sergius was built in memory of a Roman soldier called Sergius who was executed for his Christian beliefs two thousand years ago, and the monastery of Saint Takla. was built in memory of Saint Takla, a converted Christian who was hiding from her pagan father trying to save her life, so God cracked one of Maaloula’s mountains to save the saint as the myth claims. Maaloula has always been a concept and an idea not just a site, and its heritage buildings have always been narratives and hopes not only buildings. Maaloula is a manifestation of the Christianity concept in the East, to the extent that some of its people who were captured by Al-Nusra explicitly chose death over denying Christianity.

The village of Maaloula offered a wonderful holiday destination due to its proximity to Damascus (the capital of Syria) and its natural beauty. Therefore, I spent most of my youth camping with my friends in the village, with endless laughs and sleepless nights. Maaloula is also my husband’s village and the place where my late father-in-law rests in peace. Its monasteries are forever engraved in my mind with their peaceful silence, their countless steps, and their scented rosaries. The smell of burning incense and the echoing sound of byzantine hymns is forever in my memory. Maaloula’s old mountains used to be lit with bonfires and fireworks every 13th of September, the day of the holy cross, with people from all over the country coming to celebrate and dance. Then, in September 2013, the same old mountains that used to be full of joy and laughter, soon became witnesses of the beheading of their young men, the main square where I used to dance with my friends soon became a strategic target for snipers, and the old houses where I used to drink, eat, and stay up till dawn soon became looted and destroyed. The monasteries of Maaloula, alongside my memories, were damaged and ruined; and their icons were burnt and looted. This time God did not crack any mountains.

The Concept of Cultural Heritage Buildings

The concept of cultural heritage (CH) is elastic. It is presented in charters and conventions as ‘static’ historic, artistic, or scientific significance (The Venis Charter, 1964; UNESCO, 1972). In other debates, it is conceived as a ‘living’ concept when it is identified as “a mediator” (Winter, 2015, 997), as “dynamic” (Moualla and McPherson, 2019, 1), and as “a reservoir of memory that allows for the survival of collective identity” (Apaydin, 2020, 17). Similarly, the concept of cultural heritage

buildings (CHBs) (part of CH) has no consensus definition (Wise *et al.,* 2021); and quite rightly so - different definitions ask different questions. Based on similar ideas to the concept of CH, the concept of CHBs takes form in two contrasting views: the 'static' and the 'dynamic'. The 'static' view of CHBs can be attained through a partial definition included in the UNESCO (1972, 2) which defines CH group of buildings as "groups of separate or connected buildings which, because of their architecture, their homogeneity or their place in the landscape, are of outstanding universal value from the point of view of history, art, or science". The 'dynamic' view can be drawn from a European Cooperation in Science and Technology Action TD1406 point of view which articulated that a CHB "is not restricted to the building itself but also comprises its social dimension and its integration into the surroundings." (Martins (2019, 7). A more accommodating understanding of CHBs can arguably be found in the definitional landscape of 'monumental buildings', as they are viewed as tangible, but personal, CH. According to Di Giovine (2008, 26), with such buildings, " a narrative is created that links the individual with society through the selective employment of the monument's own story of its life history. Such narratives are not historical fact, however, but rather highly selective, ideological claims about the community and its connection with the site". CHBs have agency through individuals to promote certain aspects of historic events and silence others. CHBs are the living, often unresolved, negotiation of the future.

Cultural Heritage Buildings in Warzones

Research to date has tended to focus on cultural heritage buildings (CHBs) in stable and peaceful environments (Nanetti, 2021), rather than unstable environments such as warzones (Lababidi and Qassar, 2016; Stanley Price *et al.,* 2007). Even the limited literature on CHBs in warzones tends to concentrate on the technical rather than the social and individual. This section explores the meanings of CHBs in warzones through these two lenses.

Technical Approaches of Cultural Heritage Buildings in Warzones

Three areas of interest can be observed in the CHBs in warzones literature which are: (1) studies of level of damages occurred to CHBs in warzones and/or their causes, (2) documentation of the original features of threatened CHBs for future restoration if required, and (3) studies of conservation and rehabilitations processes of CHBs.

The first area focuses on producing inventories of causes and/or levels of damage occurred to CHBs during wars, which covers technical approaches including pictures, documentation, and explanation on how and why the damage occurred. For example, an inventory established by Danti *et al.,* (2017) showed that 26% of evaluated CH sites suffered from partial damages between 10% to 60%, with causes including military activity (such as airstrike, gun fire) and human activity (such as lootings, illegal excavations, agriculture, urban violation) amongst recorded 13,186 CH sites across Syria, Northern Iraq, and the State of Libya (hereafter Libya). More specifically in the context of Syria, Tubb (2013) listed examples of the damages ensued during the war of 2011 on its CHBs, including Aleppo's old market destroyed by fire and the castle of Krak des Chevaliers damaged by armed conflicts. A more recent survey of 3391 CH sites in Syria, conducted by Casana and Laugier (2017), showed that 13.44% of the sites (355 sites) were found looted, 276 sites were classified as 'minor' incidents, 52 sites as 'moderate' incidents, and 27 sites as 'severe' looting. The survey further identified other types of damage such as militarisation of heritage sites including several lines of major trenching, weaponry, heavy machinery,

and earthmoving caused by military activities, which led to severe destruction and negligence as sites became trashed, damaged, and even dangerous for containing hazardous materials.

The second area concentrates on documenting threatened CHBs in warzones, aiming to prepare a detailed technical archive of endangered CHBs should it becomes needed for restoration and rehabilitation. For example, Silver *et al.,* (2016) provided collections of pictures, 2D drawings, and 3D models for several damaged CHBs in Syria, using UNESCO 3D cameras and participation from local volunteers and professional contributors through the database of The International Committee of Architectural Photogrammetry (Comité International de la Photogrammétrie Architecturale CIPA). The study included The Great Umayyad Mosque of Aleppo, Aleppo citadel, and Palmyra. Similarly, Fangi (2015) delivered documentation on several threatened CHBs in Syria for future restoration. The documentation was presented in two formats: 'rigorous' documentation (using the tripod and the spherical head) conducted on three CHBs in Syria which are the citadel of Aleppo, the minaret of the Umayyads Mosque in Aleppo, and the Umayyads mosque in Damascus; and 'less rigorous' documentation for several other CHBs in three main sites using touristic photographs as an emergency approach to document as many threatened CHBs as possible.

The final area focuses on the restoration and rehabilitation processes of damaged CHBs, which cover perspectives such as contributing indicators and challenges to, and authenticity of, the rehabilitation processes. While some social-technical aspects were covered to explore the challenges to the rehabilitation process of post-war CHBs, the focus was on technical approaches. For example, Zugaibi (2022) produced an analysis of twenty-two CHBs in several locations in Syria which were rehabilitated or restored after the Syrian 2011 war. The study identified nine main indicators contributing to the post-war rehabilitation process, which are community participation, cultural promoting, modernism, progression during the crisis, post-conflict needs, ensuring safety and needs, budget limits, function compatibility, and location. Similarly, Sabri *et al.,* (2023) articulated that the challenges facing the rehabilitation process of CHBs in war-torn Syria are lack of funds, lack of technical expertise and decline of the skilled workforce, deficiency in heritage databases and archives, deficiencies in documentation technology, lack of material resources, problems with heritage ownerships, security and safety issues, and finally bureaucracies and weak coordination between stakeholders. The need of social and technical approaches has been emphasized by Elcheikh (2022), who argued that a holistic approach towards the rehabilitation of CHBs in warzones can be obtained through taking the local communities' involvement into considerations, in addition to experts' perspectives of technical and historical concerns. The study suggested considering the preservation of CHBs as civil rights rather than imposed plans. This approach is based on fulfilling communities' basic needs first, and then establishing an active engagement between locals and their heritages through attaining a democratic sense of citizenship, an educational movement, a peaceful environment, and a sustainable community (Albert *et al.,* 2022).

In summary, research on CHBs in warzones has been mostly focused on technical approaches. There is little consideration and reflection on the significance of social and individual aspects of CHBs in warzones, their meanings, and roles for war-torn communities.

Social Aspects of Cultural Heritage Buildings in Warzones

Memory and CH (and thus CHBs as they are part of CH) have very similar characteristics. While both notions are related to the past, they are performative acts that reproduce the present and shape the future. The argument vibrates with Sather-Wagstaff (2015, 191) who defined memory as “acts of recounting or remembering experienced events, a conceptualisation of memory as something intangible but performed in some manner over space and time. Yet memory is also simultaneously agentic in that it is an aspect of the social construction, production, and performance of everyday, lived social life which, by extension, includes heritage and identity”. A similar argument is endorsed by Apaydin (2020), who stressed that heritage is not contained in an exclusive relationship with history, nor it functions as a typical instrument of remembrance, but rather as a constant process of interaction between society, economy, and politics in present time. The creation of memory and consequently CH is very debatable indeed.

Various meanings of CH are argued to be considered as a cumulative result of communal memory and consciousness of societies and populations with whom CH is associated (The Charter of Krakow, 2001). In contrast, CH is depicted as a created invention deliberately regulated to produce a profitable creation, whether economically or politically (Ashworth and Larkham (2012). As interpreting history to produce CH means to determine which historic derived cultural heritages (CHs) are to be created and which are not based on a single logic, there is no 'one' CH but rather endless ranges of CHs, and each is created to target specific groups (Ashworth and Larkham, 2012). This argument helps explain the various narratives created around the same CHB through personal, familial, religious, political, economic, and national perspectives.

The process of choosing the various narratives and interpretations of CH is heavily influenced by politics, religion, and economy, and therefore, is influenced by asymmetries of power. It is always based on specific agendas to empower a certain version of CH and silence others (Apaydin, 2020; Ashworth and Larkham, 2012). Furthermore, while Apaydin (2020) claimed that CH is a critical tool for the survival of communities and to build resilience especially amongst 'oppressed' populations, other studies have raised doubts suggesting that not all cases of CHs have positive impacts on societies, as some might negatively imprint populations with horrific memories especially when dealing with CHs of painful events in communities’ history (Logan *et al.,* 2009). Narratives of genocides, ethnic cleansing, and/or wars may be difficult for societies to overcome.

For example, some aspects of painful memories of CHs might be celebrated as a representation of resistance like the memorial of the Nanjing massacre (Fengqi, 2009); some might be idolised as symbol of peace and never-again wars like the Hiroshima peace dome (Utaka, 2008); and, indeed some might be considered as dangerous reminders of criminal events that should never be remembered like the genocide of Cambodia (Long and Reeves, 2008). These examples begin to give insight into the shift in rules between peace and wars CHBs in warzones might be denied the luxury of being neglected ruins to become a catalyst of memory and identity and in some cases a defence mechanism for self-worth. The term ‘identity’ was defined as “the result of continuous, often tacit, social effort manifest simultaneously as the presentation of self to others through the outward projection of biography and experience, and as ‘a form of introjection', a presentation of self to self” (Butz and

Besio, 2009, 1). The tight relationship amongst CHBs, memory, and identity explains the increased international efforts towards protecting CH (and thus CHBs) in warzones since the second world war (Blake, 2000; Kila and Zeidler, 2013), more specifically since the International Humanitarian Law (IHL) considered any remissness in protecting heritage as a war crime and under special circumstances a crime against humanity (Cunliffe *et al.,* 2016). Though, it can be argued that CHBs can play a contradictory dual role of both the victim and the cause of many conflicts around the world. The devastating conflicts in several countries around the world have had extremely harmful impacts on their CH. Countries like Syria, Iraq, Libya, and the Republic of Mali (hereafter Mali) are being faced with destruction to their CH and CHBs (Logan *et al.,* 2009). CHBs have also played a part of the causes of conflict in several cases. This can be traced in ongoing conflicts such as the one between Palestine and Israel or the recent Syrian war of 2011.

Three main reasons can usefully frame CHBs as a cause of conflict. First, the concept of ‘heritage ownership’ itself had been a source of disagreement, not only between different nations and religions, but also between different sectors (e.g., the heritage sector, the construction sector) and communities within the same nations (Scarre and Coningham, 2012). Second, both CH and memory can be considered as threats by parties with different interests (Apaydin, 2020). This opens the door to the possibility of deliberately targeting and destroying CHBs aiming to destroy people’s memory and identity (Johannot-Gradis, 2015). Cunliffe *et al.,* (2016) described the deliberate CH destruction as 'cultural cleansing' which means aiming to eliminate certain communities through eliminating their presence, heritage, and memory. The aim is to deprive rival communities of their right of physical and historical existence through removing any traces of significance incarnated in heritage whether culturally, socially, or politically (Kila and Zeidler, 2013). Finally, the creation process of CH had been argued to be a political process as well (Apaydin, 2020; Ashworth and Larkham, 2012). The division in ownership, interpretation, and interests of CH and CHBs can lead to division in political and religious views and cause conflict and obstruct future reconciliation.

In summary, through the lens of CHBs we can start to understand the importance of CHBs in warzones as memory and identity. They go well beyond their static role as objects. They have confusing agency - one that can generate multilayered memories and identities whether personal, familial, religious, regional, or national; one that can build conciliation and resilience within societies, or persistent conflict.

CONCLUSIONS

This paper presents the start of an autoethnographic journey of the lead researcher's personal experience as a citizen in the Syrian war of 2011, and how this experience has led to a different insight of cultural heritage buildings (CHBs) - one where CHBs are perceived as a solace for identity, a memory depository, and a defence mechanism to reclaim self-worth and place in a community. Yet, when reviewing the literature, the main features expressed about CHBs in warzones are largely technical. Whilst these perspectives are useful to protect, conserve and preserve CHBs in warzones, they are sterile, incomplete and misunderstand buildings as catalysts and custodians of often conflicted meaning in society. The paper critically examined the view that the social aspects of CHBs in warzones are essential to better understand the true meaning and necessity of CHBs to war-torn communities trying to build something for a future that matters.

The paper is far from complete. It is autoethnography in formation. The methodology and method vision helps in making sense of the lead author's search for understanding the meanings of CHBs in warzones while the fellow authors are travellers and stewards of reflection in the lead researcher's request for such an understanding. We have introduced a formative analysis in retrospective. Future work we give reflections on action (Duncan, 2004), particular attention will be given to challenges that autoethnographers face during their journeys to use their memories and reflections as a source of data (Winkler, 2018) and the creation of co-produced narrative between the lead author and the fellow authors (Kempster and Steward, 2010).

There is a blindness to the crumbling of ancient stone and the myriad memories fractured when buildings are ripped away. My research, with my trusted travellers, will not find definitive answers. Rather, I hope, yield further questions asked of the memories of a person that was afraid thirteen years ago sheltering in a church.

REFERENCES

Albert, M-T, Bernecker, R, Cave, C, Prodan, A C and Ripp, M (Eds.) (2022) *50 Years World Heritage Convention: Shared Responsibility, Conflict and Reconciliatio*n, Cham: Springer.

Apaydin, V (2020) The interlinkage of cultural memory, heritage and discourses of construction, transformation and destruction, *In*: V Apaydin (Ed.) *Critical Perspectives on Cultural Memory and Heritage: Construction, Transformation and Destruction*, London: UCL Press, 13-30.

Ashworth, G and Larkham, P (Eds) (2012) *Building a New Heritage (RLE Tourism)*, London: Taylor and Francis Group,

Blake, J (2000) On defining the cultural heritage, *The International and Comparative Law Quarterly*, **49**, 61-85.

Butz, D and Besio, K (2009) Autoethnography, *Geography Compass*, **3**, 1660-1674.

Casana, J and Laugier, E J (2017) Satellite imagery-based monitoring of archaeological site damage in the Syrian civil war, *Plos One*, **12**(11), 0188589.

Cunliffe, E, Muhesen, N and Lostal, M (2016) The destruction of cultural property in the Syrian conflict: Legal implications and obligations, *International Journal of Cultural Property*, **23**(1), 1-31.

Danti, M, Branting, S and Penacho, S (2017) The American schools of oriental research cultural heritage initiatives: monitoring cultural heritage in Syria and Northern Iraq by geospatial imagery, *Geosciences*, **7**(4), 95.

Di Giovine, M A (2008) *The Heritage-Scape: UNESCO, World Heritage and Tourism*, Blue Ridge Summit, USA: Lexington Books/Fortress Academic.

Duncan, M (2004) Autoethnography: critical appreciation of an emerging art, *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, **3**(4), 28-39.

Elcheikh, Z (2022) Palmyra: bridging past and future, *In*: M T Albert, R Bernecker, C Cave, A C Prodan and M Ripp (Eds.) *50 Years World Heritage Convention: Shared Responsibility, Conflict and Reconciliation*, Cham: Springer.

Fangi, G (2015) Documentation of some cultural heritage emergencies in Syria in August 2010 by Spherical Photrammetry, *ISPRS Annals of the Photogrammetry, Remote Sensing and Spatial Information Sciences*, II-5/W3, 401-408.

Fengqi, Q (2009) Let the dead be remembered: Interpretation of the Nanjing Massacre Memorial, *In*: W Logan, W and K Reeves (Eds.) *Places of Pain and Shame: Dealing with 'Difficult Heritage' 1st Edition*, London: Routledge.

Hudson, M (2018) Ending technocracy with a neologism? Avivocracy as a conceptual tool, *Technology in Society*, **55**, 136-139.

Johannot-Gradis, C (2015) Protecting the past for the future: How does law protect tangible and intangible cultural heritage in armed conflict? *International Review of the Red Cross*, **97**, 1253-1275.

Kila, J and Zeidler, J (2013) *Cultural Heritage in the Crosshairs: Protecting Cultural Property During Conflict*, Boston: BRILL.

Kim, S, Whitford, M and Arcodia, C (2019) Development of intangible cultural heritage as a sustainable tourism resource: the intangible cultural heritage practitioners' perspectives, *Journal of Heritage Tourism*, **14**, 422-435.

Kempster, S and Steward, J (2010) Becoming a leader: A coproduced autoethnographic exploration of situated learning of leadership practice, *Management Learning*, **41**(2, 205-219.

Lababidi, R and Qassar (2016) Did they really forget how to do it? Iraq, Syria and the international response to protect a shared heritage, *Journal of Eastern Mediterranean Archaeology and Heritage Studies*, **4**, 341.

Logan, W S and Reeves, K (Eds.) (2009) *Places of Pain and Shame Dealing with 'Difficult Heritage' Key Issues in Cultural Heritage 1st Edition*, London: Routledge.

Long, C and Reeves, K (2008) Dig a hole and bury the past in it: reconciliation and the heritage of genocide in Cambodia, *In*: W Logan, W and K Reeves (Eds.) *Places of Pain and Shame Dealing with 'Difficult Heritage' Key Issues in Cultural Heritage 1st Edition*, London: Routledge.

Martins, J (Ed.) (2019) *Innovation in Intelligent Management of Heritage Buildings (I2mhb)*, University of Zagreb, International Research Centre for Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages, Motovun, Croatia.

Masoumi, H R, Nejati, N and Ahadi, A A (2017) Learning from the heritage architecture: developing natural ventilation in compact urban form in hot-humid climate: Case study of Bushehr, *Iran International Journal of Architectural Heritage*, **11**, 415-432.

Moualla, Y and McPherson, G (2019) Making change towards inclusive societies: The soft power of community archaeology in building cultural heritage in Mozan, Syria, *Sustainability*, **11**, 4670.

Nanetti, A (2021) Defining heritage science: A consilience pathway to treasuring the complexity of inheritable human experiences through historical method, *AI and ML Complexity*, 1-13.

Reed-Danahay, D (Ed) (1997) *Auto/Ethnography: Rewriting the Self and the Social*, Berg, London.

Sabri, R, Maya, R, Dalli, A, Daghstani, W and Mayya, S (2023) The Syrian conflict's impact on architectural heritage: Challenges and complexities in conservation planning and practice, *Journal of Architectural Conservation*, **29**, 258-274.

Salvatore, C L (2018) *Cultural Heritage Care and Management: Theory and Practice*, Rowman and Littlefield: Maryland.

Sather-Wagstaff, J (2015) Heritage and memory, *In*: E Waterton, and S Watson (Eds.) *The Palgrave Handbook of Contemporary Heritage Research*, London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Scarre, G and Coningham, R (2012) *Appropriating the Past: Philosophical Perspectives on the Practice of Archaeology*, New York: Cambridge University Press.

Sexton, R (2024) Text message with Martin Sexton, 19th May.

Silver, M, Rinaudo, F, Morezzi, E, Quenda, F and Moretti, M L (2016) The CIPA database for saving the heritage of Syria, *International Archives of the Photogrammetry, Remote Sensing and Spatial Information Sciences*, XLI-B5, 953-960.

Smith, V L (1998) War and tourism: An American ethnography, *Annals of Tourism Research*, 25, 202-227.

Stanley Price, N (Ed) (2007) *Cultural Heritage in Postwar Recovery*, Papers from the ICCROM Forum held on October 4-6, 2005, ICCROM: Rome.

Star, S L and Griesemer, J R (1989) Institutional ecology, 'Translations' and boundary objects: Amateurs and professionals in Berkeley's Museum of Vertebrate Zoology 1907-39, *Social Studies of Science*, **19**, 387-420.

The Charter of Krakow (2001) *Principles for Conservation and Restoration of Built Heritage*, Krakow.

The Venis Charter (1964) *2nd International Congress of Architects and Technicians of Historic Monuments*, Venice.

Tubb, J N (2013) Editorial: Syria's cultural heritage, *Palestine Exploration Quarterly*, **145**, 177-181.

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) (1972) *Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage*, Paris: UNESCO.

Utaka, Y (2008) The Hiroshima 'Peace Memorial': Transforming legacy, memories and landscapes, *In*: W Logan and K Reeves (Eds.) *Places of Pain and Shame: Dealing with 'Difficult Heritage' 1st Edition*, Routledge, London.

Winkler, I (2018), Doing autoethnography: Facing challenges, taking choices, accepting responsibilities, *Qualitative Inquiry*, **24**(4), 236-247.

Winter, T (2015) Heritage diplomacy, *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, **21**, 997-1015.

Wise, F, Jones, D and Moncaster, A (2021) Reducing carbon from heritage buildings: the importance of residents' views, values and behaviours, *Journal of Architectural Conservation*, **27**, 117-146.

Zugaibi, M (2022) Dealing with heritage in Syria: the analysis of the conflict period (2011-2021), *Periodica Polytechnica Architecture*, **53**, 260-274.