

*Maria Inês Pinho,
Sérgio Veludo and Maria Fátima Lambert⁹⁴*

CULTURAL HERITAGE AS A TARGET IN CONFLICT SCENARIOS

Scientific paper
<https://doi.org/10.59014/HLZP8057>

Abstract

The focus of this paper is on increasing challenges that Europe faces when it comes to the defense and security of cultural heritage under the legal framework developed by the United Nations (UN) and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), and based on the Hague Convention of 1954. Cultural heritage has been, for a long time and in diverse circumstances, both a strategic war target and a hostage in conflicts such as the Balkan Wars and conflicts in the Middle East, and now in Ukraine. Heritage has been intentionally destroyed or threatened, among others, by sophisticated military technologies such as drones, thermobaric explosive devices and in ultima ratio the nuclear weapons threat, which has had severe psychological and physical effects on the people. The growth of the asymmetrical military conflicts in Europe is observed due to the new technologies of war. How does this make cultural heritage a desirable target? Are there mechanisms created by international organizations to act in defense of heritage in the event of an armed conflict?

In order to answer these research questions, the research methodology used in this paper will start with a review of literature about threatening processes in European conflicts, and continue with the collection of data on institutional platforms in order to create the basis for a proposal, an observatory for this theme.

The final conclusion is that cultural heritage is in itself powerful, but also deeply symbolic and fragile at the same time. This power becomes an identity enforcer of a nation and can be considered as a morale booster.

Keywords: armed conflict, cultural heritage, cultural property, NATO, UNESCO.

⁹⁴ School of Education of Polytechnic of Porto, inespinho@ese.ipp.pt
School of Education of Polytechnic of Porto, sergioveludo@ese.ipp.pt
School of Education of Polytechnic of Porto, flambert@ese.ipp.pt

Introduction

Cultural heritage is, in essence, a concept that corresponds to a set of goods of various nature in laws and conventions. One of its main attributions is the ability to be enjoyed by citizens, either in a universal sense or integrated in a certain community identity. In summary, cultural heritage is a part of the fundamental elements of a people's identity.

The reflection developed during this research leads to an analysis of cultural heritage defense doctrines in armed conflicts. This idea involves not only the government and its institutional agents such as the ministry of defense, education or economy, but also other structures such as museums and, finally, the collective consciousness of all citizens.

In its simplest expression, if it may be said considering the complexity and vastness of the concept itself, cultural heritage, in terms of its dynamics, is characterized by a series of multidisciplinary activities through which the past becomes legible, interpretable, and perceptible in the present. In this context, many of those who focus on these issues in their academic work or operational practices manage to establish integrated work bases in institutions, which, in terms of methodology, result in the preservation, dissemination and viability of tangible and intangible memories of the past. The vast conceptualization and practice on cultural heritage lead to several questions that continue to be relevant to this day – what should be conserved and what not? Which material and immaterial memories are relevant to the identity substrate of people, nation, or state? Which criteria, ethics, deontologist perspectives, or laws determine the destiny of human production that is called culture? And after all this, how can war affect cultural heritage, and how could the international community like the United Nations (UN) intervene to protect human achievements, when human life is above all morally?

To answer these questions, the authors will use research methodology that starts with the review of literature about defense and security regarding threatening processes in European conflicts. This will be followed by data collection on institutional platforms and correspondent data discussion mapping elements known so far. In the end, we will look into possibilities for future research in countries that face similar situations.

The challenging approaches to armed conflicts and cultural heritage

In a recent article, Dacia Viejo Rose pointed out that “cultural heritage is a central element in the stories that society tells about itself, its origins, character, and future projects, delineating boundaries of belonging and defining who lies outside them” (Viejo Rose, 2021, 41). The principle that recognizes an expanded and deepest intensity when experiencing intangible or material heritage content belonging to one’s native community is another commonly accepted point of view. This means that the transmission, tradition, and familiar beliefs and episodes concerning this issue are shaped by psycho-affective reasons and inner motions as well as the emerging possibility of sharing ideas with other people nearby: it is a matter of a circumscriptive circle. This also means that the symbolic value attributed by those who belong to the community is clearly differently added and felt because it is introspectively contextualized.

Viejo Rose (2021) wrote her article before the Russian aggression on Ukraine, and her reflections arise from recent guerrilla/irregular warfare against cultural heritage as an act of ideology, which takes place in a different context, although some comparisons may be identified as aggressions. Nevertheless, the concept, though keeping its previous meaning, incorporated variations driven by time mentality and pragmatic facts:

“Today heritage is understood as a process of meaning making with constantly evolving associative values that is highly political. (...) The implications of understanding heritage as a process of meaning-making are that it is a highly political and continuously evolving; this volatility disturbs the semantic stability previously associated with heritage sites. Furthermore, it is the relational value of heritage that has come to the fore” (Viejo Rose, 2021, 42).

Three questions are common to any conflict: “What is the process of cultural violence? How is heritage instrumental to it? How can societies recover from the impact of this violence?” People have to be, to exist there, so heritage is experienced as it should and may be transferred between generations. Culture heritage without people lacks its major meaningful goal. Only women and men have the sense, the enlightenment, the capacity of interpreting symbology – Cassirer (1944) *dixit*. In reflections and

research about the main issue of protecting cultural heritage from threats and disasters, we may ask the question: “How does cultural heritage become a victim, or a target or even a hostage”?

Since the late 1990's, NATO established a cooperation with UNESCO through the Blue Shield Project partnership. In 1999, The Hague Convention Second Protocol introduced the Blue Shield as an advisory board and operational doctrine enhancer to UNESCO on Cultural Property Protection (CPP). This was quite clearly a response to the conflicts in the Balkans and the Middle East, in which cultural heritage became a tactical and strategic target, which we have also seen more recently in the war in Ukraine.

One of the most important issues regarding this kind of partnership was the establishment of rules of engagement for legitimized military operations, requested by the UN or NATO, or even the European Union (EU), to safeguard cultural properties in armed conflicts. There was already a well-established set of rules for humanitarian missions and peacekeeping operations, although always focused on the value of human life. But how to deal with cultural property and heritage? This question has been discussed in a number of doctrinal documents and research papers that will be summarized below.

One of the first examples is the *Handbook on the protection of cultural property in the event of armed conflict* by Mirikelam and Frin (2015). Several chapters of this handbook strive to provide clear instructions and engage the French Army Detached Forces on specific objectives. It is important to mention that the preface to this handbook was written by the UNESCO Director-General at the time, Irina Bokova, and is titled *Culture on the frontline of modern conflicts*.

Other NATO and UNESCO publications, such as those detailed below, confirm the evolution of this concept following the evolution of conflicts themselves after the appearance of large-scale terrorist organizations like ISIS or Syria. UNESCO sponsored the publication *Protection of Cultural Property Military Manual*, proposed by the specialists O'Keefe, Péron, Musayev and Ferrari (2017), for whom the protection of cultural heritage as a property is fundamental. As the authors stated, “In strategic terms, the protection of cultural property in armed conflict is an imperative. Avoidable destruction or damage and all misappropriation of cultural

property by military forces, especially foreign military forces, as well as its looting by others through these forces' lack of vigilance, endangers mission success" (O'Keefe, Péron, Musayev and Ferrari, 2017, 1).

Another publication titled *NATO AND CULTURAL PROPERTY Embracing New Challenges in the Era of Identity Wars* was published in the same year as a doctrine document alongside the abovementioned *Report of the NATO Science for Peace and Security Project: Best Practices for Cultural Property Protection in NATO-led Military Operations*. This publication was a very important NATO document in the period 2014-2017 (NATO Code: SPS project # G4866). Rosén (2017), as Project Director of NATO CPP Board, mentioned as the bulk of this report that:

"In 2014 allied nations approved a two-year NATO Science for Peace and Security project called "Best Practices for Cultural Property Protection in NATO-led Military Operations" (NATO SPS CPP). The stated aim of the NATO SPS CPP project includes developing recommendations on how NATO should approach the question of policy and doctrine related to CPP. To this aim, this report evaluates a) the role of cultural property (CP) in the wars of the 21st century and the rationale for NATO to consider CPP; b) existing work on CPP in NATO; c) lessons identified from NATO-led and non-NATO-led military operations and allied nations; and d) the way forward for CPP in NATO" (Rosén, 2017, 9).

This report was not the last one. There are other, more recent documents that have been drafted and classified as assets by NATO standards.

These topics have also been discussed in publications other than NATO handbooks and manuals, especially because various perspectives combined theoretical reflections and the results of the above reports, facilitating new approaches and questions to the very sensitive question of prioritization of human life or cultural property in armed conflicts. Cunliffe, Fox and Stone (2018), members of the Blue Shield committee, provided deep reflections about the pending challenges of protecting cultural property, and asked a very important question: can the CPP, regarding the main strategical operational frameworks in an armed conflict, become an unnecessary distraction or a relevant mission priority?

Armed conflicts led to damage and destruction of cultural heritage both as collateral damage and as intended targets. However, in large scale military

operations, which involve a massive engagement of financial, human and material resources, a delicate balance is sought between prioritizing human life and/or cultural heritage. This is what is observed in NATO's activity, especially with the USA support.

With the resulting economic crisis, this can become a difficult but inevitable option to take. This is one of the reflections made by Cunniffe, Fox and Stone (2018), which has also been noted in academic studies, such as the one by Baj (2022), who analyses the UN Resolution 2347, giving a well-structured approach to the historical background of military aggression against cultural heritage. This resolution was not about a particular event, but looked at the full context of international armed conflicts and the distinctions between small scale engagements and large-scale war in failed states like Syria, in the Middle Eastern conflict zones and in Ukraine. Earlier UN resolutions, like Resolution 2199 (2015), reflected on the other side of the threat against cultural heritage: illegal trafficking of artwork and cultural assets, which is equally damaging as a drone or missile attack (United Nations, 2015).

However, the most important contribution relates to the analysis of the lessons learned from years of cultural heritage protection in several kinds of conflicts and uncontrollable crises (again Ukraine?). Kelly (2021) introduces a series of basic, although pertinent, questions that frame the real state of threats to cultural heritage. Firstly, cultural heritage is a humanitarian law asset, which is a very important point that earlier authors had not focused on so much in their analyses. According to this author, the protection of cultural heritage is a side subject in military practice (hence the importance of manuals and handbooks on these subjects directed at armed intervention doctrines). Kelly (2021) also states that it was inevitable that human rights movements and organizations would not yet be inclined to make a connection between protecting human lives and protecting culture. These lines of thinking do not undermine the importance of cultural heritage protection, but many feel that this is an unclear field of ethic debate. As Kelly states: "cultural heritage protection is important in peacebuilding and development work, but as yet little systematic evidence as to 'what works'" (Kelly, 2021, 2).

Puskás (2021) presents another perspective concerning European policies for cultural property protection in conflicts. She defends a doctrine for

NATO rules of engagement in military operations protecting cultural heritage. However, Iraq and Syria and the fight against terrorism were one thing, and confronting the Russian aggression and the deliberate use of artillery and tactical non-nuclear missiles against cultural landmarks in Ukraine is a completely different matter. As the author puts it:

“Reflecting on the changing nature of 21st century conflicts and on lessons learned from NATO operations and missions, a Science for Peace and Security (SPS) Programme has been launched on CPP in 2014 to improve NATO’s activities and institutional framework in this field, uniquely using both a conceptual and a practical military approach. The final report of the project has formulated several recommendations for enhancing the establishment of a NATO CPP framework, emphasizing that as CPP has a cross-cutting nature, it is an element to be mainstreamed in the whole range of NATO activities” (Puskás, 2021, 168)

Following this line of analysis, Wang (2022) focuses his reflections on the debate about the need to articulate the international humanitarian law and the protection of cultural property in armed conflict scenarios, and the kind of challenges that will be necessary to accomplish these goals. As Wang says: “(...) before the 1998-1999 war in Kosovo, Serbian law did not protect Kosovar cultural property such as mosques from the Ottoman period, with only a few exceptions. As a result, Serbian religious historical sites in Kosovo were destroyed after the conflict, and UN military personnel were needed to protect them” (Wang, 2022, p.68). At the same time, an International NATO force (KFOR) was and is still present in Kosovo, with an UN mandate to prevent the escalation of the conflict between Kosovars and Serbians. Both sides targeted the other side’s mosques and Orthodox churches in 1998 and 1999. Nowadays, the UN, EU and NATO can only assist indirectly in the war in Ukraine, which has lasted for almost 12 months. In addition to the humanitarian disaster that is still unfolding, Russian missiles and artillery keep targeting Ukrainian cultural heritage with a most clear purpose of erasing the enemy’s cultural right to exist.

People identities and cultural heritage in war contexts

Relationship between cultural heritage and conflicts

In situations of war and other scenarios of armed conflicts, such as terrorism, UNESCO and the local authorities do their best to “mark cultural sites and monuments with the distinctive ‘Blue Shield’ emblem of the 1954 Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property (...) to avoid deliberate or accidental damage” as can be understood in the sense of the *Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict with Regulations for the Execution of the Convention of Hague, 14 May 1954* (UNESCO, 1954).

In his analysis of the present situation of the war in Ukraine, Lassiter points out:

“The destruction of cultural sites in the Russian invasion of Ukraine demonstrates the calamitous power that war continues to have on cultural property across all areas of the world. Targeting historical and religious sites is not a new tactic, and the trend will not be stopped with the current policies in place. The actions of the International Criminal Court and the United Nations in the coming months and years will be telling as to what organizations will be most successful in preventing destruction and preserving cultural sites in the future” (Lassiter, 2022, 22).

Which conclusions can be drawn at present from the relationship between cultural heritage and conflict?

Until now, this relationship has been studied largely in terms of how treasured objects and sites are physically destroyed and looted during wars, and the measures employed to mitigate this damage. These approaches focus on the materiality of heritage, considering it as a passive resource to be protected. Lassiter’s (2022) analysis of recent changes in armed conflicts and threats to cultural heritage, from large-scale terrorism activity to conventional war scenarios like Ukraine, shows that presently there is a broader range of enhanced dangers regarding the protection of cultural property. This is supported by the statements from affected communities, like in Ukraine, such as those cited above. Heritage is not only used to

build cohesion; it can also be used as a weapon. This has important implications for the design of reconstruction and reparations, for how do you build something new on a mined field.

Strategies for Ukrainian cultural heritage in times of war

Few days after the war began, on the 8 March 2022, UNESCO expressed its concern in a press-release titled “Endangered heritage in Ukraine: UNESCO reinforces protective measures”, last updated at 21 April 2022. In the press-release, Audrey Azoulay, UNESCO Director-General (2022) states: “We must safeguard the cultural heritage in Ukraine, as a testimony of the past but also as a catalyst for peace and cohesion for the future, which the international community has a duty to protect and preserve”. Cultural heritage director expressed how urgent it was and how the situation had to be followed-up in the field, in order to track as much of the damage as possible. Later on, Azoulay goes on to state: “The first challenge is to mark cultural heritage sites and monuments and recall their special status as protected areas under international law” (Azoulay, 2022), and points out that: “Properties inscribed on World Heritage list, such as the site of ‘Kyiv: Saint-Sophia Cathedral and Related Monastic Buildings, Kyiv-Pechersk Lavra’, are considered a priority. The marking process started this weekend at the site of ‘Lviv – the Ensemble of the Historic Centre’ (Azoulay, 2022).

In addition to the process of marking, safety measures were also quickly taken in the first week of the war, as shown, for example, on Bernard Armangue’s photo published in *Euronews Culture*, under the subtitle: “Lviv museums empty out as the cultural sector moves heritage objects ahead of a possible push westward” (Gallagher, 2022). Another key measure was promoted on social networks, asking the public to use their knowledge of destroyed/damaged properties and their GPS coordinates and/or audio-visual captions, and input information to an access-friendly and well-operating website developed by the Ministry of Culture and Information Policy of Ukraine (2022a).

A few weeks after the war started, by the middle of March, anyone could already access ten pages containing a list of damaged locations and heritage goods. In late June, 383 destroyed cultural objects were reported, and

the number of pages on the platform had increased to 39. The website provides a list of evidence of the effects of the war and destruction, grouping material heritage in categories including “Places of worship”; “Historic/Heritage Buildings/Architecture” and/or “Ancient Buildings”; “Urban Planning” and “Monuments”, which are the most cited and numerous, followed by “Museums” and “Theatres”; “Libraries”; “Archives” and a few “Sculptures”.

The 383 destroyed/damaged objects are identified and chronologically positioned depending on their origin and geographical location. A short description of each item is provided, including information on typologies and characteristics. The platform is user-friendly since items can be accessed by clicking “enter” or “see more” menus. The crude portraits of destruction are there to be seen, the corresponding photos accessible in a single click. The images are of good quality, also showing the surroundings of the ruins or damaged places, and sometimes persons, both military or civilians, are visible near the destroyed or ruined areas. In a few of the photos, given the appearance of the buildings depicted, one might think the image was taken before the war, because the damage is at a first glance almost imperceptible.

The safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage is of general interest to humanity and should therefore be pursued through a cooperation between bilateral, subregional, regional, and international parties. Communities, groups and, when applicable, individuals should never be alienated from their own intangible cultural heritage.

Since 10 March, *Ukrainian Cultural Foundation* (UCF, 2022b), has been operating as an Archive/Research Platform that collects information about heritage and cultural war casualties and issues, complementing the above-mentioned platform operated by the Ministry of Culture and Information Policy. The UCF is described as:

“a state-owned institution created in 2017 in correspondence with the Law of Ukraine with aim to facilitate development of culture and arts in Ukraine, to provide favorable environment for development of intellectual and spiritual potential of individuals and society, wide access for the citizens to national Cultural Heritage, to support cultural diversity and integration of the Ukrainian culture into the world cultural space. The Ukrainian Cultural Foundation

supports projects through a competitive selection process. Activities of the Ukrainian Cultural Foundation are guided and coordinated by the Ministry of Culture of Ukraine” (UCF, 2022a).

The list of categories on the UCF website is heterogeneous, and also includes among war crimes some less recognized subcategories such as the destruction of or damage to archeological objects: mounds, shafts of ancient earthen fortifications, excavation sites, etc.; facts of injury/death of civilians as a result of the weapons used in an attempt to damage cultural facilities by the occupiers; and seizure of property, looting of museums, libraries and other cultural institutions by the occupiers. The website announces that data available for public use will be published on the portal, and verified materials can be transferred to the International Criminal Court in Hague for investigation” (UCF, 2022b).

In summary, when reading UCF principles concerning its “Mission”, “Priority Activities” and “Strategic Goals”, it is quite clear why so many other Cultural Heritage Nominations were presented to UNESCO between 1989 and 2019.

Before ending this chapter, it is important to mention the UNESCO’s Tentative List as another strategy for defending Ukrainian cultural heritage.

A *Tentative List* is an inventory of those properties which each state party intends to consider for nomination. Table 1 is an example of a list of Ukrainian properties.

Ukraine’s strategy regarding cultural heritage aims not only to preserve past heritage for the present and future, but also insists on raising awareness of modern heritage. Ukrainian members have been active partners at renowned groups and associations such Europa Nostra (founded in Paris, 1963). Another example is the Digital Agora, a platform targeting all interested citizens, which asks them for direct cooperation and input on social networks and other broader communication tools.

Table 1 List of properties

<u>Historic Centre of Tchernigov, 9th -13th centuries - 1989</u>
<u>Cultural Landscape of Canyon in Kamenets-Podilsk - 1989</u>
Tarass Shevchenko Tomb and State Historical and Natural Museum – Reserve - 1989
National Steppe Biosphere Reserve "Askaniya Nowa" - 1989
Dendrological Park "Sofijivka" - 2000
Bagçesaray Palace of the Crimean Khans - 2003
Archaeological Site "Stone Tomb" - 2006
Mykolayiv Astronomical Observatory - 2007
Complex of the Sudak Fortress Monuments of the 6th - 16th c.- 2007
Astronomical Observatories of Ukraine - 2008
Historic Center of the Port City of Odessa - 2009
Kyiv: Saint Sophia Cathedral with Related Monastic Buildings, St. Cyril's and St. Andrew's Churches, Kyiv-Pechersk Lavra (extension of Kyiv: Saint-Sophia Cathedral and Related Monastic Buildings, Kyiv-Pechersk Lavra) - 2009
Trading Posts and Fortifications on Genoese Trade Routes. From the Mediterranean to the Black Sea - 2010
Cultural Landscape of "Cave Towns" of the Crimean Gothia - 2012
<u>The historical surroundings of Crimean Khans' capital in Bakhchysarai - 2012</u>
<u>Derzhprom (the State Industry Building) - 2017</u>
<u>Tyras - Bilhorod (Akkerman), on the way from the Black Sea to the Baltic Sea - 2019</u>

Source: <https://whc.unesco.org/en/statesparties/ua>

A variety of actions are also taking place in the European community, such as the appeal to the international community formulated by the Mayor of Krakow:

“The appeal is addressing all public and private institutions, conservation services and institutions engaged in the protection and restoration of Cultural Heritage, the partner cities, museums, universities, libraries, archives, construction companies, warehouses, supermarkets, fire departments, Voluntary Fire Brigades, security companies, as well as companies involved in restoration and conservation – for material and technical support in protecting priceless cultural assets (objects, museum collections, equipment of shrines and temples) from fire and warfare.” (Krakow open city, 2022)

This appeal was made on 3 March from L'viv. All details, procedures and orientations are stated on the website. According to <https://whc.unesco.org/en/statesparties/ua>, Kyiv and L'viv have 32 interventions recognized by UNESCO. These two cities, together with Kharkiv and Odessa, are the major cultural heritage sites. They are also members of UNESCO's Creative Cities Network. This makes them fundamental for the history of humanity, as well as for personal and collective memory.

Research Methodology and Discussion of Results

Questions raised in the paper can now be schematized in the form of research objectives. This empirical study seeks to understand:

- a) What is the situation regarding the defense and security of cultural heritage in an environment of armed conflict?
- b) What mechanisms have the international organizations developed to act in defense of cultural heritage in the event of armed conflict?
- c) Does the fact that the doctrines are not applicable in all cases lead to risks such as the possibility of a 3rd World War?

In the beginning of their work on this paper, the authors proposed qualitative research that would analyze in-depth interviews with war refugees, who would share their testimonies on these initial ideas. However, as the authors started collecting data, it became quite clear that the refugees were psychologically unable to help the investigation team. The first desired result thus proved impossible to achieve. The research team therefore decided to postpone the interviews and subsequent discussion of results.

The war in Ukraine led to a sudden suspension of cultural life in the country. Indeed, most artists have lost their source of income, art collections are threatened, and an increasing number of heritage properties are being destroyed and/or damaged. Cumulatively, many artists and cultural professionals chose to leave for EU countries, thus working in exile.

According to the Ministry of Culture and Information Policy of Ukraine (2022b; 2022c) at the end of June 2022, the figures were as follows:

- 123 cultural heritage sites had been damaged;
- 9 cultural heritage sites had been completely destroyed;
- 79 culture/theaters/library buildings had been destroyed.

In September 2022, the MCIP (Ministry of Culture and Information Policy of Ukraine) had information about 479 Russian crimes against Ukrainian cultural heritage on record. This national platform (available at <https://culturecrimes.mkip.gov.ua>) aims to share up-to-date information, photos, and videos depicting the destruction of heritage culture, show useful resources for learning the Ukrainian language, share projects to fight disinformation, or present war poetry, among many other initiatives.

Most of the crimes (97) took place in the Kharkiv region (80 in the city and the remaining 17 in the surroundings). The following table summarizes the cases documented in the main Ukrainian cities:

Table 2. Number of documented cases, by Ukrainian cities, of destruction of cultural heritage

Ukrainian city	Number of documented cases
Donetsk	92
Mariupol	61
Kyiv	70
Bucha	44
Chernihiv	38
Luhansk	32
Sumy	28
Zaporizhia	13
Zhytomyr	6
Kherson	5
Mykolaiv	4
Dnipropetrovsk	3
Odesa	2
Lviv	1

Source: Adapted from Biletska, T., 2022, Personal memories of the war and reflections on the power of cultural relations, ENCATC Newsletter, issue n°3, August 2022, pp. 18-24.

Currently, we know that nine cultural heritage sites in the Donetsk, Kyiv, Sumy and Chernihiv regions have been completely destroyed, and the condition of another 25 damaged objects remains unknown. All damaged buildings have sustained different levels of destruction: 58 were severely damaged, mostly by artillery fire, missile hits and aerial attacks, and 123 were moderately damaged. Among the damaged sites, 21 are sites of national importance, 95 are sites of local importance, and seven are newly discovered cultural heritage sites. 173 sites were slightly damaged, also due to close combat engagements.

In total, more than 100 valuable historic buildings were damaged or destroyed, with the religious buildings being the most affected.

The Russian Army and Russophone separatists of Donbass and Donetsk destroyed 43 memorials in Ukraine honoring historical figures and events of the 19th to early 21st century, 31 buildings and complexes of museums and reserves, 79 culture, theater and library buildings, as well as some other valuable historical or similar buildings.

Conclusions

When the war started in mid-February 2022, it became clear that this would be a conflict not only between two peoples (Russian and Ukrainian), but between all of humanity, realizing that, from now on, wars would come to symbolize an act of cruelty against the possibility of any country to choose its own path of development, instead of representing a conflict between diverse interests (economic or religious, among others).

In this sense, the concept of security asserts itself as the guarantee of non-violent and diplomatic behavior, or as the resolution of any international dispute and the prevention of any type of military escalation, becoming the fifth pillar of sustainable development, together with economic growth, inclusion, environmental balance, and cultural development through inclusion in public policies.

Furthermore, issues such as security and peace become the focus of social development, understanding that, without it, humanity will be increasingly close to planetary disaster and self-destruction.

The war in Ukraine has led to the biggest refugee movements in Europe since World War II. Thousands of women, children and old people were displaced and had to leave behind their personal belongings. Despite these harsh conditions and the deep psychological damage that was inflicted on all those victims of this war, with no end on the horizon, most of them are struggling to maintain their identity and culture. This is also a way to resist the risks of a cultural genocide. These spiritual wounds sustained by the Ukrainian refugees need to be tended and supported by providing cultural practices and programs that help overcome the war trauma. It is

an opportunity to improve art therapy and to promote cultural interactions between the refugees and the host countries.

By synthesizing a set of doctrines from different international organizations in this paper, the authors found that there is a series of documents that provide for action aimed at preventing damage to cultural heritage and at protecting it in case of armed conflict. However, the situation is sadly ironic given that, despite the existence of a doctrine and rules of engagement that should be used in all situations, the *real politik* sometimes does not allow it.

If the above principles were applied to protect the Ukrainian cultural heritage, enforced by NATO intervention, we could slide into World War III. If this happened, there would be no more heritage to protect, which is a manifestation of “inverse power”.

The case of the Ukrainian war is not the only one. There are other scenarios in which cultural heritage is at risk across the world that require further analysis, many of them under UNESCO protection. It would be beneficial to carry on this research to obtain a broader mapping of countries in similar situations.

Despite all the scientific and theoretical grounds presented in this paper, the opinions and feelings of the Ukrainian people are irreplaceable. We will respect their time while still living in Portugal to achieve one of the main goals of this project, never losing sight of the human face of war.

References

- Azoulay, A. (2022) Endangered heritage in Ukraine: UNESCO reinforces protective measures. URL: <https://www.unesco.org/en/articles/endangered-heritage-ukraine-unesco-reinforces-protective-measures> [accessed: 25th June 2022]
- Baj, G. (2022). Cultural heritage during armed conflict. The UN Security Council resolution 2347 (2017), its scope and its consequences. *Paix et sécurité européenne et internationale*.
- Biletska, T. (2022). Personal memories of the war and reflections on the power of cultural relations, *ENCATC Newsletter*, 3, 18-24.
- Cassirer, E. (1944). *Essay on Man*. New York: Doubleday & Company Ed.

- Cunliffe, E., Fox, P., Stone, P. (2018). The protection of cultural property in the event of armed conflict: unnecessary distraction or mission-relevant priority?. *NATO Open Publications*, 2 (4), 1-22.
- Gallagher, T. (2022). URL: <https://www.euronews.com/culture/2022/03/07/this-is-our-story-lviv-museums-move-to-protect-ukrainian-heritage> [accessed: 14th september 2022].
- Kraków open City. (2022). Appeal and fundraising for the protection of Lviv's cultural heritage. URL https://www.krakow.pl/krakow_open_city/news/258023,245,komunikat,appeal_and_fundraising_for_the_protection_of_lviv_s_cultural_heritage.html [accessed: 30th June 2022]
- Kelly, L. (2021). Lessons Learned on Cultural Heritage Protection in Conflict and Protracted Crisis. *Open Documents of Institute of Development Studies*.
- Lassiter, L. (2022). *Destruction of Cultural Sites: A Historical Analysis* (Doctoral dissertation. Florida: Southern College.
- Ministry of Culture and Information Policy of Ukraine (MCIP). (2022a). Destroyed Cultural Heritage of Ukraine URL: <https://culturecrimes.mkip.gov.ua/3> , [accessed: 9th September 2022]
- Ministry of Culture and Information Policy of Ukraine (MCIP). (2022b). Destroyed Cultural Heritage of Ukraine URL: <https://culturecrimes.mkip.gov.ua> , [accessed: 9th September 2022]
- Ministry of Culture and Information Policy of Ukraine (MCIP). (2022c). Destroyed Cultural Heritage of Ukraine URL: <https://mkip.gov.ua/news/7325.html> , [accessed: 9th September 2022]
- Mirikelam, F. i Frin, P. (2015). *Handbook on the protection of cultural protection in the event of the armed conflict*. Ministère de la Défense Armée de Terre, P.F.T 5.3.2 [EMP 50.655], France: Centre de Doctrine d'emploi des forces Division Doctrine.
- O'Keefe, R., Péron, C., Musayev, T., i Ferrari, G. (2017). *Protection of cultural property: military manual*. UNESCO Publishing.
- Puskás, A. (2021). Culture Matters: European International Organizations Policies for Cultural Property Protection in Conflicts and Crisis Situations. *National Security Review, Military National Security Service*, 2, 165-187.
- Rosén, F. (2017). *NATO and Cultural Property: Embracing New Challenges in the Era of Identity Wars..* Copenhagen: Nordic Center for Cultural Heritage and Armed Conflict.
- UCF. (2022a). Ukrainian Cultural Foundation, URL: <https://ucf.in.ua/en/p/about>, [accessed: 14th September 2022]
- UCF. (2022b) Ukrainian Cultural Foundation, URL: <https://ucf.in.ua/en/news/10-03-2022>, [accessed: 14th September 2022]

- UNESCO. (1954) Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the event of the armed conflict- URL <https://en.unesco.org/protecting-heritage/convention-and-protocols/1954-convention> [accessed: 14th september 2022]
- United Nations. (2015). *Resolution 2199 (2015)*. Security Council URL: <https://documents-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N15/040/28/PDF/N1504028.pdf?OpenElement>, [accessed: 30th June 2022]
- Viejo Rose, D. (2021). Cultural violence against heritage: process, experience, and impact. In edited (Ed.), *Experiencing Violence* (pp. 41-48). the British Academy URL: <https://www.thebritishacademy.ac.uk/documents/3305/Experiencing-Violence.pdf>, [accessed: 30th June 2022]
- Wang, Y. (2022). International Humanitarian Law and the Protection of Cultural Property in Contemporary Armed Conflict: Current Issues and Challenges. *Law and Economy*, 1(4), 67-74.

KULTURNA BAŠTINA KAO META U SCENARIJIMA SUKOBA

Sažetak

Cilj ovog rada je usredotočiti se na povećanje europskih izazova za obranu i sigurnost kulturne baštine, pod pravnim okvirom Ujedinjenih naroda (UN) i Organizacije Ujedinjenih naroda za obrazovanje, znanost i kulturu (UNESCO) – koji se još uvijek temelji na Haškoj konvenciji iz 1954. Kulturna baština je dugo vremena i u različitim okolnostima bila i strateška ratna meta i talac u sukobima poput Balkanskih ratova, Bliskog istoka i sada Ukrajine. Nasljeđe je namjerno uništeno ili pod prijetnjom, s teškim psihološkim i fizičkim učincima na stanovništvo, uključujući sofisticirane vojne tehnologije kao što su bespilotne letjelice, termobarične eksplozivne naprave i u konačnici prijetnja nuklearnim oružjem. Primjećuje se rast asimetričnih vojnih sukoba u Europi zbog novih tehnologija ratovanja. Kako to čini kulturnu baštinu poželjnom metom? Postoje li mehanizmi koje su stvorile međunarodne organizacije za djelovanje u obrani baštine u slučaju oružanog sukoba?

Kako bi se odgovorilo na ova istraživačka pitanja, metodologija istraživanja započet će revizijom literature o prijetećim procesima u europskim sukobima. Zatim će se postaviti s prikupljanjem podataka o institucionalnim platformama kako bi se stvorila osnova za prijedlog, Opservatorij za ovu temu.

Na kraju, rezultati će zaključiti da je kulturna baština, sama po sebi, moć i da je u isto vrijeme duboko simbolična i krhka. Ova moć postaje sredstvo za jačanje identiteta nacije i može se smatrati dizačem morala.

Ključne riječi: vojni konflikt, kulturna baština, kulturni posjed, NATO, UNESCO