



**QUEEN'S  
UNIVERSITY  
BELFAST**

## **Destruction of Heritage as a Strategy of Mass Violence: Assessing Harm to Inform Meaningful Measures of Repair**

Viejo Rose, D., & Killean, R. (2020). Destruction of Heritage as a Strategy of Mass Violence: Assessing Harm to Inform Meaningful Measures of Repair. In *The Arab Regional Centre for World Heritage: Conference on Integrated Reconstruction and Post-Trauma Impact on Communities and Socio-economic: Proceedings*

### **Published in:**

The Arab Regional Centre for World Heritage: Conference on Integrated Reconstruction and Post-Trauma Impact on Communities and Socio-economic: Proceedings

### **Document Version:**

Peer reviewed version

### **Queen's University Belfast - Research Portal:**

[Link to publication record in Queen's University Belfast Research Portal](#)

### **Publisher rights**

© 2020 The Authors.

### **General rights**

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Queen's University Belfast Research Portal is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

### **Take down policy**

The Research Portal is Queen's institutional repository that provides access to Queen's research output. Every effort has been made to ensure that content in the Research Portal does not infringe any person's rights, or applicable UK laws. If you discover content in the Research Portal that you believe breaches copyright or violates any law, please contact [openaccess@qub.ac.uk](mailto:openaccess@qub.ac.uk).

**Destruction of Heritage as a Strategy of Mass Violence:  
Assessing Harm to Inform Meaningful Measures of Repair**

Dr Dacia Viejo-Rose, Department of Archaeology, Cambridge Heritage Research Centre (CHRC), University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK

Dr Rachel Killean, School of Law, Human Rights Centre (HRC), Queen's University Belfast, Belfast, Northern Ireland

**Abstract:**

This contribution builds upon research on the reconstruction of cultural heritage, reparations and victimhood in post-conflict settings. It mainly focuses on the example of Cambodia but reference other more distant and recent cases as well. It combines a legal human rights approaches with those of heritage studies to propose that the harm done to individuals and communities by violence against cultural heritage is more complex than we have thus far considered. We explore measures to develop meaningful forms of repair that can contribute to overcoming the long-term effects of cultural violence through processes of co-creation and heritage development across generations. Cambodia serves as the main case to exemplify the unfolding of community-led heritage recovery and its links with psycho-social recovery. We advocate that the psycho-social recovery of the community be central to heritage recovery work and not a hoped-for side-effect of it.

**Keywords:** Cultural Heritage, Destruction, Reparations, Harm, Violence, Repair, Inter-generational Transmission

**MAIN TEXT:**

*Compare [the Cham] to hill tribes, they are identified as a group, they have elements like language and culture, and examples for their people to follow. For my generation, there is nothing left, we don't have anything to follow. The main challenge is how to get sources, how to assemble this information together.<sup>1</sup>*

Attacks on cultural heritage have been a common weapon of war. Such violence is often associated with direct violence against individuals who identify with religious, ethnic, national and racial groups, including genocide, as an explicit means to wipe out their existence. International law has to an extent been attuned to these issues, outlining conventions to protect and prohibit the destruction of cultural property in armed conflict (Hague Convention of 1954) and more recently cultural heritage. Yet, while the physical dimension of destruction is apparent during conflict and to an extent can be restored, the deeper intent that seeks to subjugate, dominate and wipe out the identities of groups has received less attention.

As the above quote from one of our Cham interviewees in Cambodia illustrates, the damage caused by cultural violence goes well beyond the destruction of monuments, and the reparative work of reassembling what has been lost can be very challenging when ruptures and loss have been so effective. Yet, obligations to repair such damage, in particular the intangible damage

to cultural heritage and identity, is often overlooked in favour of monumental heritage sites. This has important implications in post-conflict societies, where cultural objects can be rebuilt, but the cultural knowledge and heritage that resides in the oral traditions and rituals of elder generations are increasingly lost.

Reparations is a topic that has for the most part been the realm of legal scholars and has until recently rarely touched on cultural heritage destruction save for the odd case. Other disciplines and activists have engaged with the idea in terms of reparations for the mass violence of colonialism slavery, but again cultural violence and destruction were minor considerations. Recent events however, and in particular the Al Mahdi case heard at the International Criminal Court (ICC) on the deliberate destruction of religious and historic buildings in Timbuktu, Mali has brought the issue, and our lack of understanding of it, to the fore. Not only are there lacunas in how we understand the ramifications of violence done to cultural heritage but we are very far from having a toolbox of measures for putting together coherent measures of repair for such destruction, especially measures that take into account psycho-social needs.

The recent reparations decision at the ICC highlights the rift between physical damage and intangible harm (Reparations Order, *The Prosecutor v. Ahmad Al Faqi Al Mahdi* ICC-01/12-01/15-236). While the Court ordered measures to restore the physical damage of the buildings, and economic harm to traders, its symbolic measures fell short of victims' expectations and their intangible suffering, such as their religious practices and knowledge, which remain at risk from the ongoing conflict. These issues show a broader concern amongst international courts and tribunals as well as humanitarian law to find better criminal and reparative systems for addressing cultural harm in times of mass violence or displacement.

The problem of evaluating the destruction of cultural heritage exclusively as a one-off act of violence is that the resulting solution is to restore what was destroyed by that one event. These, often highly mediated and dramatic acts, however are only one highly visible aspect of the destruction of cultural heritage which is far more encompassing and attacks not only monuments but entire collectives and the individuals that constitute them. It is a process of systemic and symbolic violence that makes the events possible and that lasts long after these are no longer front-page news (Viejo-Rose 2013).

An assumption appears intrinsic to reparations decisions made by courts that distinguishes symbolic reparations from material and economic ones (de Greiff 2008) but where does that leave society? Existing frameworks for providing reparations can often fail to take into consideration how the affected communities understand their experience of harm and how they might want to see that harm addressed. (South Africa has similar rulings indicating that repair needs to go beyond compensation for material loss, as do many of the truth commission recommendations in Latin America; the outstanding issue is implementation.)

By way of an illustrative example, in this paper, we explore the ways in which the harms caused by genocidal attacks on cultural heritage are understood and framed amongst the Cham community of Cambodia. The Cham were subjected to religious persecution and genocide during the Khmer Rouge regime (1975-1979), during which cultural indicators such as buildings, dress and language were targeted. Drawing from interviews and focus groups conducted with some 75 members of the Cham community, we highlight experiences of harm which extend beyond the loss of objects, to include social and cultural intergenerational harms. We then explore the implications of these harms for reparations and note the need for a strong element of community engagement in any reparative process.

## The Cham of Cambodia

In 1975, the Cham constituted Cambodia's largest minority group, characterised by their practice of Islam, their use of the Cham language, and their preference for living in self-contained communities adjacent but separate from the Buddhist Khmer majority (So, 2011). When the Khmer Rouge came to power, they quickly sought to eradicate signifiers of difference amongst the population (Osman, 2002). Communities were required to abandon expressions of religion and culture and to dedicate themselves to the revolution, under threat of 're-education', torture or even death. For the Cham, this policy of forced assimilation resulted in the destruction of various religiously and culturally significant buildings and objects, including an estimated 130 mosques as well as religious texts and traditional modes of dress (Headley, 1987; So, 2011). As detailed succinctly by one interviewee: 'when we returned, nothing [was] left.'<sup>2</sup> The impacts of these policies were profound for the Cham group. The attacks on religious buildings were experienced as an attack on the life of their community, as expressed by one interviewee: 'it's like they hold our mosque hostage or it's like they arrest our children. I feel suffering'.<sup>3</sup>

Such comments highlight the emotional damage caused by the loss of culturally significant objects, damage that can be exacerbated when the loss of property is accompanied by other physical, emotional or moral harms. In the case of the Cham, related attacks on cultural identity, such as being forced to adopt Khmer names and abandon their language, habits and religious practices was viewed as a traumatic violation.<sup>4</sup> This became particularly pronounced when they were forced to carry out activities that were prohibited by their religion, such as eat pork, or in the case of women, cut their hair. Religious items were frequently profaned as well as destroyed, for example by housing pigs in mosques, or using Qu'rans as toilet paper (So, 2011).

The group also endured attacks on their traditional ways of living. While communities of all backgrounds were subjected to phases of forced movement during the regime, the Cham would find themselves deliberately separated from their communities and uprooted from the micro-societies in which they lived. As described by an interviewee: 'this community before had about 700 families and they were separated... only one or two families met each other during the evacuation.'<sup>5</sup> As a group without substantial textual culture, this process of separation had significant implications for the ability of communities to transmit and retain a sense of community and identity (Gray, 2015). As expressed by one interviewee: 'the Khmer Rouge also cut off or lessened relationships between families...that's why it was very hard during that time in terms of religious practices and also personal life.'<sup>6</sup>

The Cham in several cases attempt to push back against these restrictions and attacks (Osman, 2006). However, resistance was met with violence and death, as the Khmer Rouge's policy with regards to the Cham developed from one of persecution and assimilation to one of genocidal extermination through purges, mass arrests and killings. This policy, when combined with both the regime's policy of targeting the educated and the impacts of years of forced labour and starvation meant that by the end of the regime few community leaders or religious teachers remained alive (Bruckmayr, 2015). As one interviewee expressed it, 'it seemed that they targeted educated or those who knew about Islam.'<sup>7</sup>

The destruction of cultural property, prohibition of religious and cultural expression, separation of communities and deliberate targeting of teachers and leaders, resulted in a profound sense of 'community destruction'. Coined by Bernadette Atuahene, this term refers to processes

through which ‘a community of people is dehumanized or infantilized, involuntarily uprooted, and deprived of the social and emotional ties that define and sustain them’ (Atuahene, 2016: 801). The impacts of this experience have extended through time and subsequent generations, due to the Cham’s shortage of human resources and capacity in the aftermath of the regime. Without access to tangible and intangible cultural anchors, it became very difficult for the Cham to collect and pass on their cultural knowledge and sustain a sense of connection to their traditions. Such harms resonate with Claudia Card’s concept of ‘social death’, devised to describe the intergenerational ‘natal alienation’ that can follow the loss of cultural heritage (Card, 2003). As expressed by one interviewee: ‘imagine that those who were educated left and [left] only those who didn’t know, and this is like living in the darkness.’<sup>8</sup>

### **Reflections on the Nature of Harm**

The example of the Cham highlights that while much of the international focus on the destruction of cultural heritage is on the damage to monuments sites, occasionally collections and objects, this, often highly performative, destruction is only one of many modalities in which this violence is exerted. The forced displacement of people, dislocating them from intimately known environments, can be enormously destructive. A characteristic of conflict is that the civilian population is displaced, not only dislocating people from their contexts but also making older members of communities particularly vulnerable, many of whom die and with them the possibilities for cultural heritage transmission to later generations. Displacements that force the separation of communities such that families and cultural groups are dispersed and lose contact are a further violence of this dynamic causing breaks in transmission but also in the hugely important practice and iteration of cultural heritage. Censoring languages, outlawing cultural practices, targeting artists and cultural leaders, are all as destructive in their effects and experiences of harm as the destruction of monuments or cities, and can have ramifications that continue to be felt by subsequent generations.

Our exploration of harm is premised by the understanding that when it comes to the destruction of cultural heritage, harm is not contained in a one-off act of violence, but is a process with a lead-up, a continuation, and attrition, with micro-aggressions that become normalised. What we take from this is that any mechanism of repair is also necessarily a process rather than a specific ‘solution’. Focusing on the process will allow us to identify stages of repair, for what might make sense immediately following the initial destruction might not a generation later when the harm is still being felt but in a different way. The long-term view is essential not least because we are coming now to a period whereby some of the conflicts that have most marked the start of the century are coming to important generational marks.

Violence against cultural heritage does not exist in a vacuum but is part of a system of violence that in its various manifestations – symbolic and structural as well as direct – exists over a long-drawn out period of time. A degree of violence makes the destruction of cultural heritage possible, and this violence continues, often long after peace is formally achieved. It is difficult to put an end point on the harm wrought by armed conflict and mass violence. In this paper we instead base ourselves in the idea that this harm exists in a continuum with no clear end date. Rather, it goes through various transformations. Understanding harm not as a one-off, temporally discrete, consequence of a violent event but rather a process of response to drawn out violence lets us conceptualise repair as a parallel process that also undergoes various iterations.

## **Processes of Repair**

In international law, in particular in human rights, reparations have been the main legal tool to acknowledge and remedy as far as possible the harm caused by violations. In the face of mass atrocities and large universes of victims, reparations are often prioritised to those seen to have suffered the most, namely gross violations of their civil and political rights, i.e. torture, murder, disappearance, and sexual violence. As a result, violations of cultural identity or cultural loss as a result of mass atrocities are neglected, leaving victims to try to cope. Even in cases of massacres, reparations have been limited to the generation that experienced the violence. This excludes those born afterwards, despite such victims experiencing the transmission of trauma, inheritance of poverty and loss of cultural identity, which together impinge upon them and their communities' ability to memorialise the past. That said, in cases where reparation has been delivered, such as victims being able to own and return to their communal land, it has enabled them to reconstitute their 'cultural anchors' and reclaim their dignity.

Given the inevitable quandary between unrepairable harms caused by mass atrocities and limited resources in post-conflict societies, there has been an increasing emphasis on the importance of process as reparative and symbolism. In terms of process, treating victims who were in the past dehumanised and violated as individuals with rights and with views that should be respected is part of the dignification process. In terms of symbolism, as no amount of compensation can undo gross violations of human rights, it can instead provide official acknowledgement of the wrongdoing suffered by victims, potentially being seen as 'good enough' to psychologically satisfy them (Lykes & Mersky 2006). More public measures, such as apologies and memorials, are directed at 'awakening' public consciousness around such harm and continuing suffering so as to rebuild social trust and mitigate the recurrence of such violations.

As we noted above, repair is in practice often a process rather than a one-off event. In the case of the Cham, recent attempts at reparation must be situated in the context of forty years in which the Cham have largely had to repair and rebuild their lives without intervention, assistance or official reparation from the state. In the years that followed the fall of the Khmer Rouge in 1979, members of the Cham community returned to their communities when possible, and slowly began the process of rebuilding their homes and communal property.<sup>9</sup> As described by one interviewee: 'We tried to build our life with our bare hands and tried to build a hut and then build a Sorav [small religious building] close by'.<sup>10</sup> Reflecting the harms caused by the loss of community knowledge and practice highlighted above, emphasis was generally placed on creating a space in which to gather, rebuild community and engage in religious practices and teachings, rather than ensuring specific forms of property restoration. This process was slow and facilitated by both domestic legal reforms that enabled collective ownership of community buildings (Un and So, 2011) and international financial aid from a range of non-governmental donors. Reforms that facilitated the free expression of religion and culture were also frequently praised by interviewees.<sup>11</sup> In addition to highlighting the importance placed upon community and identity, this process draws our attention to the role that 'ordinary' or non-specific legal frameworks around property and human rights can play in facilitating measures of restoration and repair after attacks on cultural heritage.

## **Reparations, Cultural Heritage and Intergenerational Harm**

While for many years the Cham remained without access to justice or repair, in 2010 the Extraordinary Chambers in the Courts of Cambodia (ECCC) released an indictment, charging

four former senior leaders of the Khmer Rouge with a range of crimes, including the religious persecution and genocide of the Cham. In 2018, the Court found two accused (the other two passed away prior to judgment) guilty of the crime of persecution on political, religious and racial grounds, and in the case of one accused, genocide against the Cham.<sup>12</sup> In considering the crimes committed against the Cham, the Trial Chamber specifically acknowledged the processes through which the group were deprived of their cultural heritage. For example, it highlighted processes of targeted transfer through which the Cham were separated from one another, acknowledging that prior to their displacement, Cham people had been living in their respective communities for generations. The Chamber also highlighted the shutting down of mosques, prohibition of traditional clothes, religious practice and the Cham language, and incidences of Cham being forced to eat pork and cut their hair. It noted that the consequence of this was that the Cham were unable to preserve their religious and cultural identity, and that this targeted policy crystallised into one of specific genocidal intent. The Chamber acknowledged that the abandonment of religion and religious traditions caused profound emotional trauma, and the loss of identity.

The prosecution of these former senior leaders opened up the possibility of reparations for survivors of the regime, including the Cham community. The ECCC grants victims the ability to participate as ‘civil parties’ who are able to apply for “collective and moral” reparations, defined as reparations which “acknowledge the harm” suffered by civil parties and “provide benefits” which address this harm. The intention appears to be to respond to moral harms, such as emotional distress, or damage inflicted on social structures, values and human comforts, as distinguishable from material reparations for lost property and other such quantifiable losses. Due to the unique nature of the ECCC’s mandate, reparations are predominantly proposed and implemented by a range of civil society organisations, and in many cases are only retrospectively recognised as ‘reparations’ by the Court (Sperfeldt and Oeung, 2019). In relation to the crimes perpetrated against the Cham, the ECCC recognised two reparation projects: a Community Media Project comprising two films, an exhibition, a website and a blog, and a mobile exhibition discussing the experiences of the Cham and ethnic Vietnamese during the regime.<sup>13</sup> Both were framed as projects ‘aimed at guaranteeing non-repetition’ by acknowledging harm, documenting experiences, raising awareness about their treatment and promoting non-discrimination in order to prevent the recurrence of crimes against the group.<sup>14</sup>

This community-based approach to recognising harm and suffering, and from there initiating a conversation about meaningful measures of repair can serve as a guideline for exploring reparative mechanisms in other sites such as Palmyra in Syria. In Palmyra the urge of the international community to rebuild the World Heritage site is worth reigning in so that it can truly accompany reparative work such that the most affected communities are engaged as active participants in the process. This mode of working would complement suggestions<sup>15</sup> to focus on the Museum of Palmyra first. The Museum could become a forum of encounter where the population of Palmyra can have a say in the modes of reconstruction and be active participants in interpreting their heritage in line with an inclusive epistemic justice (Pantazatos, 2018).

As noted above, ‘awakening’ public consciousness, rebuilding social trust and mitigating the recurrence of such violations can play an important part in reparations. However, these projects cannot be considered to have addressed the specific ongoing harms felt by the Cham community as a result of their loss of cultural heritage. In particular, the ongoing impacts of ‘community destruction’ remain largely without redress. Indeed, while members of the Cham community did participate at the ECCC and appeared to appreciate the opportunity to do so.<sup>16</sup> it does not appear that either project was deeply grounded in expressions of need from Cham

communities. Rather, the projects were initiated by the civil society organisations themselves (Killean and Moffett, 2021). This was reflected in our interviews, which took place after the implementation of these projects (as an aside, it is also notable that few interviewees had heard of these measures, although a number had engaged with the ECCC process). Requests for assistance in restoring or rebuilding religious buildings and community meeting halls were linked to identity preservation, expressed through wishes that ‘the young generation learn and discuss the history...and preserve religion.’<sup>17</sup> Some noted the need to address the lack of documents about the Cham: ‘we were not allowed to publish, all the documents were burned...now, our young people don’t have any witnesses...I think it’s good if we can keep some culture to show.’<sup>18</sup> Others discussed the continued loss of cultural anchors and sources of information about the past. As one interviewee observed ‘everything is changed because during the Khmer Rouge regime everything [was] destroyed. We try to research, but we have limited resources. We need support from other organisations to provide training to teachers.’<sup>19</sup>

A desire to connect with identity was also reflected in interviews with the younger generation, one of whom suggested ‘creating a research centre or library for the Cham community to place all kinds of documents.’<sup>20</sup> This desire for locations in which to learn mirrored the wishes of survivors in several communities, as exemplified in this exchange:

Interviewee: When they saw people praying, they would die, there was no religious practice, there was no ‘Cham’... they burn the Qu’ran... they evacuate the community to different places... the mosques were destroyed.

Interviewer: What would reparation look like?

Interviewee: Build the meeting hall, the resting place, the museum, inform the young generation...bring the legacy of the people who died during the regime.<sup>21</sup>

The example of the Cham arguably draws our attention for the need for reparations that are expansive, cultural-attuned and grounded in the specific experiences and wishes of the communities. Responding to the range of interlinked harms that can result from the targeting of cultural heritage requires a shift in thinking, one that moves beyond a focus on restitution and/or reconstruction to more holistic measures of repair that mirror the intergenerational and ongoing nature of the harm. This might involve multiple iterations, and a ‘spectrum of interventions’ rather than a one-off process of repair (Fletcher and Weinstein, 2002: 581). The potential benefits of such a shift in how repair to cultural destruction is approached are significant as this broader approach would make it possible to pursue not only the peace-building aims of UNESCO’s heritage work but also some of the UN’s Sustainable Development Goals (SDG). A holistic approach that acknowledges the associative value of heritage could translate into heritage repair projects that contribute, for example, to SDG goals 3-Good Health and Well-Being and 4-Quality Education with the potential of contributing to several others.<sup>22</sup> Research on heritage in relation to both well-being and quality education (e.g. Power and Smyth, 2016 and Sayer, 2018) has shown just how effective the hands-on approach is when individuals are provided even with basic training to participate in the excavation, conservation, or interpretation of heritage.

### **Concluding thoughts**

In the aftermath of armed conflict, cultural heritage can be used to serve a number of functions acting simultaneously as receptor, container, and reflector of meaning and emotions. Whether

it is rebuilt, restored, ignored, or preserved in a ruined state, each action will be presented and interpreted as part of the construction of the new, post-conflict, society. It is also important to consider however, that conflict not only destroys but also transforms cultural heritage by adding or altering meanings, by severing ties between people and their heritage, and by targeting intangible dimensions. The post-conflict management of cultural heritage thus occurs on the basis of a transformed social and symbolic landscape and the intangible dimensions matter enormously as it is through these that the associative value is (re)built. In emerging from the chaos of war, societies often aspire to create order and in so doing quickly rebuilding important heritage sites with significant symbolic reach can be seen as a way of recovering normality. When this is done in parallel to economic and psycho-social recovery rather than as a key element in that process however, it can serve to further dissociate communities from heritage instead. The Cham case showed what happens when no international involvement is offered and the impetus for heritage recovery has to come from the community itself. With this piece we identify some indications of meaningful measures of repair that have come out of our research to date that have the potential to overcome the long-term effects of cultural violence through processes of co-creation and heritage development across generations.

Cultural heritage can be a richly textured tool to engage in bringing a variety of groups together, to discuss, share stories, and collaborate in activities that will help define them as a community. Achieving access to and education about this heritage is essential, for without them there will be no sense of individual and group ‘ownership’ of cultural heritage and it is precisely that alienation which ultimately fuels destruction both inside and outside of armed conflicts. What our research has also shown is that when adequately harnessed in post-conflict processes, cultural heritage can be a resource in a society’s recovery presenting pathways to achieving dignity and well-being, and thus fitting the SDG framework of community-determined values with a focus on SDG 16 of Peace, Justice and Strong Institutions, and being in line with UNESCO’s World Heritage and Sustainable Development policy.

Based on our case study, we have identified six concluding suggestions:

- Identifying and repairing the harm done by cultural violence against heritage should be viewed as potentially requiring long-term and intangible methods;
- Genuine consultation and engagement with victimised communities, ideally featuring continued engagement through the design of reparative measures, should be central;
- Those responsible for reparations should be willing to look beyond loss of physical items to consider diverse harms that may extend beyond the directly victimised generation;
- The loss of cultural heritage must be contextualised within a range of related forms of moral, emotional and physical harms;
- Reparation should be understood as a process potentially encompassing diverse specific and non-specific interventions, including but not limited to specific processes of restoration;
- The intergenerational challenges of lost heritage should be recognised, as should the need to facilitate connection between those harmed, their ancestors and descendants.

### **Acknowledgements**

Luke Moffett, Robin Hickey, Farina So, Vannara Orn, Documentation Center of Cambodia all partners on the project *Restoring cultural property to communities after conflict* (AHRC PaCC

grant Conflict and International Development Innovation Award (AH/P007929/1), and Kara Blackmore for the numerous conversations and joint thinking on the issues discussed in this piece.

### Short Bio of the Authors

Dr Dacia Viejo-Rose is a Senior Lecturer in Heritage and the Politics of the Past at the Department of Archaeology, University of Cambridge where she is also Deputy-Director of the Cambridge Heritage Research Centre and director of Studies in Archaeology at Selwyn College. Before entering academia, Dr Viejo-Rose worked as a consultant for several international organisations and cultural policy institutes. Her first book was "Reconstructing Spain: Cultural Heritage and Memory after Civil War" (SAP 2013), she has also co-edited two volumes "War and Cultural Heritage" (2015 CUP) and "Memorials in the Aftermath of Armed Conflict" (Palgrave 2019).

Dr Rachel Killean is a Senior Lecturer in Law at the School of Law, Queen's University Belfast, where she was the Deputy Director of the Human Rights Centre from 2016-2019. Her research centres around victims' rights, transitional justice and hierarchies of harm, predominantly in South East Asia. Her first book, 'Victims, Atrocity and International Criminal Justice: Lessons from Cambodia', was published by Routledge in 2018. She has published in the Journal of International Criminal Justice, the International Journal of Transitional Justice, and the International Journal of Human Rights, amongst others.

### Bibliography

- Atuahene, B. 2016. 'Dignity Takings and Dignity Restoration: Creating a New Theoretical Framework for Understanding Involuntary Property Loss and the Remedies Required', in *Law and Social Inquiry*, Fall, 41:4, 796-823.
- Atuahene, B. 2016. *We Want What's Ours: Learning from South Africa's Land Restitution Program*, OUP.
- Ernesto Verdeja, E. 2006. A Normative Theory of Reparations in Transitional Democracies, *Metaphilosophy* 37( 3-4), July, 449-469.
- De Greiff, P, 2008. "Justice and Reparations", in de Greiff (ed) *The Handbook of Reparations*, Oxford: OUP.
- Fletcher, L.E. and Weinstein, H.M. 2002. 'Violence and Social Repair' *Human Rights Quarterly* 24.
- Hamber, B. 2005. The dilemmas of reparations: In search of a process-driven approach, in K. De Feyter, S. Parmnetier, M. Bossuyt and P. Lemmens (eds.), *Out of the Ashes: Reparation for Victims of Gross and Systematic Human Rights Violations* (Intersentia 2005), 135-149, p137.
- Headley, R. 1987. 'The Society and its Environment' in Russell Ross (ed) *A Country Study: Cambodia*, US Government Printing Office.
- ICC-01/12-01/15-236. 17 August 2017. Trial Chamber VIII. Reparations Order. Decision. Case: The Prosecutor v. Ahmad Al Faqi Al Mahdi. <https://www.icc-cpi.int/Pages/record.aspx?docNo=ICC-01/12-01/15-236>
- Jeffery, R. 2014. 'Beyond Repair? Collective and Moral Reparations at the Extraordinary Chambers in the Courts of Cambodia' 13 *Journal of Human Rights* 103.

- Killean, R. and Moffett, L. 2021. 'What's in a Name? Reparations at the Extraordinary Chambers in the Courts of Cambodia' *Melbourne Journal of International Law* 21(1) 2021.
- Lykes, B.M. and M. Mersky. 2006. "Reparations and Mental Health: Psychosocial Interventions Towards Healing, Human Agency, and Rethreading Social Realities", in P. de Greiff (ed) *The Handbook of Reparations*. Oxford University Press.
- Olick, J. 2007. *The politics of Regret: On Collective memory and Historical Responsibility*, Routledge.
- Moffett, L., D.Viejo Rose & R. Hickey. 2020. "Shifting the paradigm on cultural property and heritage in international law and armed conflict: time to talk about reparations?", *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 26:7, 619-634.
- Osman, Y. 2002. *Oukoubah*, DC-Cam.
- Osman, Y. 2006. *The Cham Rebellion*. DC-Cam.
- Power, A. and K. Smyth. 2016. "Heritage, health and place: The legacies of local heritage conservation on social well-being", *Health and Place* 39(2016): 160-167.
- Pantazatos, A. 2018. "Heritage, Participant Perspective Epistemic Injustice, Immigrants and Identity Formation", in C. Holtorf, A. Pantazatos and G. F. Scarre (eds). *Cultural Heritage, Ethics and Contemporary Migrations*. Routledge.
- Prosecutor v Al Mahdi*, Decision on the Updated Implementation Plan from the Trust Fund for Victims, ICC-01/12-01/15-324-Red, 04-03-2019.
- Sayer, F. 2018. "Understanding Well-Being: A Mechanism for Measuring the Heritage Practice on Well-Being", *The Oxford Hand-book of Public Heritage Theory and Practice*. Oxford: OUP.
- So, F. 2011. *The Hijab of Cambodia*, DC-Cam.
- Sperfeldt, C. and Oeung, J. 2019. 'The Evolution of Cambodian Civil Society's Involvement with Victim Participation at the Khmer Rouge Trials' in Lia Kent, Joanne Wallis and Claire Cronin, *Civil Society and Transitional Justice in Asia and the Pacific*, ANU Press.
- Un, K. and So, S. 2011. 'Land Rights in Cambodia' *Pacific Affairs* 84: 290-294.
- Viejo-Rose, D. 2013. "Reconstructing Heritage in the Aftermath of Civil War: Re-Visioning the Nation and the Implications of International Involvement", *Journal of Statebuilding and Intervention*, Special Issue on Cultural Interventions, 7(2): 125-148.

**Full mailing address and telephone number of the authors for sending print copies:**

**Dacia Viejo-Rose**, Selwyn College, Grange Road, Cambridge CB3 9DQ, United Kingdom.

Tel.: +44 (0) 7780918346

**Rachel Killean**, School of Law, Main Site Tower, Queen's University Belfast, Belfast, BT7

Tel.: +44 (0) 7875526299

---

<sup>1</sup> Interview, Islamic Leader, Chroy Changva, 16 March 2017.

<sup>2</sup> Focus Group, Islamic Leaders and Cham Women, Phnom Penh, 16 March 2017.

<sup>3</sup> Interview, Islamic Leader, Svay Khleang, 21 March 2017.

<sup>4</sup> Focus group, Cham community, Kampong Tralach, 19 March 2017; Interview, Islamic Leader, Ponnea Leu, 12 March 2017.

<sup>5</sup> Focus Group, Islamic teachers, Chroy Changva, 16 March 2017.

<sup>6</sup> Focus Group, Cham Women, Kandal, 18 March 2017.

<sup>7</sup> Focus Group, Islamic Leader and Cham Women, Phnom Penh, 16 March 2017.

<sup>8</sup> Focus Group, Islamic leaders, Phnom Penh, 16 March 2017.

<sup>9</sup> Focus Group, Cham Women, Svay Khleang, 22 March 2017.

<sup>10</sup> Focus Group, Islamic Leaders and Teachers, Ponnea Leu, 12 March 2017.

---

<sup>11</sup> Focus Group, Islamic teachers, Kandal, 12 March 2017; Focus Group, Cham Women, Kandal, 12 March 2017.

<sup>12</sup> *Case 002/02*, Trial Judgment, 002/19-09-2007/ECCC/TC, 16 November 2018

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid*, para 4423, 4425.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid*, para 4457.

<sup>15</sup> For instance, during the discussion at the “Technical Meeting on the Recovery of the World Heritage Site of Palmyra”, UNESCO, Paris, 18 December 2019.

<sup>16</sup> Focus Group, Civil Parties, Svay Khleang, 21 March 2017.

<sup>17</sup> Focus Group, Civil Parties, Svay Khleang, 21 March 2017.

<sup>18</sup> Interview, Cham Civil Society Staff Member, Phnom Penh, 16 March 2017

<sup>19</sup> Focus Group, Cham community, Kampong Tralach, 19 March 2017.

<sup>20</sup> Focus Group, Cham Students, Phnom Penh, 14 March 2017.

<sup>21</sup> Focus Group, Civil Parties, Svay Khleang, 21 March 2017.

<sup>22</sup> Other SDG’s that such an approach could contribute to include 5 Gender Equality, 8 Decent Work and Economic Growth, 11 Sustainable Cities and Communities, and 16 Peace, Justice and Strong Institutions. Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels