



The *Erasmus Mundus Joint Master Degree* DYCLAM+, an idea that was born thanks to ProPEACE

DYCLAM + (DYnamics of Cultural LANDscape, Heritage, Memory and Conflictualities) is the fruit of a long-standing cooperation between its partners and associated partners and it is part of the virtuous line of Erasmus Mundus Masters Dyclam and MACLANDS. But it is now a question of proposing an enriched partnership and a new problematic, adapted to the current issues and to the strongly renewed needs of the cultural heritage professional sector. Indeed, DYCLAM + is based on the historic partnership uniting the Jean Monnet University of Saint-Étienne (France), the Polytechnic Institute of Tomar (Portugal) and the Federico II University of Naples (Italy), which collaborate together on different programs (MCEM and Strategic Partnership) for more than 10 years. The Consortium includes a new full partner, Babes Bolyai University in Cluj-Napoca (Romania) and associated partners fully integrated into the new educational structure. Full partners are bound by Erasmus Active agreements.

The genesis of the Consortium DYCLAM + was born of exchanges and consultations initiated during four meetings in 2017: a workshop in Edinburgh from 9 to 15 April; a working meeting on 13 September in Firminy (France); a meeting in Saint-Étienne on October 19th on the occasion of the 30th anniversary of Erasmus; an international conference on December 11 and 12 2017 in Saint-Étienne that has been yet published¹. These meetings highlighted the common needs of developing a new concept and the need to meet to meet the challenges of the moment, the new demands of employers and the objectives of both Europe and the international community.



¹ *Géopolitique, conflits et patrimoine/Geopolitics, conflicts and heritage* (Robert Belot dir.), *Ethnologies*, université Laval (Canada), vol. 39, n°1, 2018.

New context, new issues, new skills

In the last decade, the issue of cultural heritage has acquired a new dimension. As early as the 1970s, cultural heritage was conceived and viewed as a geopolitical instrument that served a desire to unify and universalize the world. It was necessary to promote the *World Heritage* (1972 Convention). This ambition was in fact largely Eurocentric, because of a very “monumentalist” conception of heritage. Twenty years later, an extension of the notion of cultural heritage to that of “cultural landscape” and then to that of “intangible heritage” has made it possible to ensure a geographically more equitable distribution of World Heritage sites. The end of the cold war, the “globalization”, the emergence of a middle class in the ex-colonized countries, the intensification of transnational human mobilities and the increase of tourist flows, the digitalization of the communication were a determining factor of development of “heritage culture”. Never before has the international community been so mobilized on the heritage issue; if for 45 years we spoke of “world heritage”, we must now try to think and evaluate the *globalization of the heritage phenomenon and its consequences* (positive and negative). For this movement towards a sort of world heritage has not been without producing unexpected perverse effects, source of new conflicts and geopolitical disorder.

The paradox of the world situation at the beginning of the third millennium comes from sitting at the “triumph” of the cultural and natural heritage at a time when it has never been so vilified, exploited, looted, destroyed, to such an extent that it has become a weapon and a target of war. There would be “threats to the memory of humanity” (Jean-Pierre Perrin). The political destabilization of the Middle East has led to numerous destruction of ancient World Heritage sites, such as the site of Palmyra (2015), which had provoked the cry of distress of the antiquarian historian Paul Veyne and a global turmoil. It was not just a pre-Islamic place that was destroyed; it was an attack on UNESCO as an institution to ensure the enhancement of cultural diversity, but it was also an attack on the very idea of heritage as a witness to our historicity. Heritage hatred and “historicide” engage a vision of the world and it challenges the international community.

An international conference brought together some 40 states and private institutions in Abu Dhabi (December 2016) to create a financial fund to protect heritage in times of conflict.

The United Nations, through the United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR), has developed the UNOSAT program to provide imagery analysis and satellite solutions to organizations working in the humanitarian field, security but also heritage in danger. This involves compiling and analyzing satellite data and producing highly accurate geographical maps of areas of the world that are affected or threatened by conflict or natural disaster to enable experts to accurately assess the needs for planning climate change measures, repair and reconstruction. On another level, the European Union has taken steps to identify and neutralize illicit trafficking in cultural property that is developing because of the geopolitical instability of certain areas. The dialectics depatrimonialization / repatrimonialization also concerns past wars and the environmental issue. For example, UNESCO is currently (2018) interested in the underwater cultural heritage of the Second World War in the Pacific: how to manage the risks of pollution (related to oil and unexploded ordnance on wrecks) while preserving the wreck sites that have become historical sites with strong tourist potential?

The dominant discourse on cultural heritage and landscape is marked by a kind of common fiction that tends to neglect their ontological reversibility. This discourse favors the supposedly “resilient” and “analgesic” effects of the patrimonial approach. Heritage would naturally be endowed with a virtue of reconciliation, reparation, integration and social cohesion, within a community, between communities, between countries. This is *the Mostar bridge effect*. Heritage would have the capacity to revitalize and revitalize territories in difficulty and in disuse. He would be able to rewrite torn or unhappy identities and reconstruct memories denied or looted. It is what we could call *the Addis Ababa effect*. Revealing this dominant trend is the Namur Declaration (22-24 April 2015) on the occasion of the 6th Conference of Ministers of the Council of Europe on Cultural Heritage in Europe: “Cultural Heritage in the 21st Century to live better together. Towards a common strategy for Europe”.

Heritage can also produce the opposite. It can be a geopolitical weapon that revives and maintains divisions, encourages conflictuality, crystallizes tensions. It is *the Hebron effect*. The patrimony can thus be the object of political instrumentalization and serve the logics of identitarian and separatist exclusion for purposes of hegemonization. This is *the Crimean effect*.

The West is not left out, if one thinks of the wave of removal of bolt of the statues (in the United States, in Canada and elsewhere) which unfolded from the middle of the years 2010. A heritage project can cause tensions and conflicts of use and design: for example, the management plan of the site "Laponia" (Sweden) took more than 10 years to see the day because it crystallized the oppositions between the Sami local populations and Swedish conservation actors.

Our ambition is to analyze, on a world scale, the concrete situations where the patrimonial factor can serve or serve the virtues unanimously attributed to it. Thus, it will be possible to leave the world of "magical thinking" to look at reality in all its complexity. The ultimate goal is to better understand how societies and communities are engaging in heritage to promote prevention actions or to devise remedial mechanisms.

The current conflicts (but also the climatic degradation and the economic effects that it causes) have provoked another way of depatrimonialization: *the cultural uprooting of the victims of the forced migrations*. Migration flows have never been so massive, with major political consequences in the countries concerned (the rise of extreme rights in Europe). Migrants are carriers of a cultural heritage that they overinvest to the extent that they suffer a very difficult material situation. How, then, can we find a dialectic of reconciliation and harmonization between the multiple singular heritages and the dominant heritage of the host countries? The very current and very sensitive issue (geopolitically and morally) of *the restitution of cultural property stolen during the colonial period* is part of these new questions that cultural heritage actors can not avoid. New skills are to be acquired. Training must be created to respond to it.

It is first necessary to analyze these new phenomena, but also to imagine the means that can be implemented to either rebuild the destroyed or damaged heritage (thanks to digital technologies), or use the heritage as a source of reliance between the communities or as a vector of palingsy within a society in order to understand how the "ways of being together" could be invented in a world that is thought to be unified and pacified while it is confronted with growing heterogeneity that can have belligerent effects.

The necessity to train to the complexity of the heritage phenomenon which must now be thought of on a world scale

During the Edinburgh workshop (9-15 April, Intensive Program ProPEACE, European Strategic Partnership) and the symposium on 11 and 12 December 2017 organized in Saint-Etienne at the invitation of Professor Robert Belot (*Geopolitics, Conflicts & Heritage*), the creation of the new EMJMD has become obvious. In April 2017, in Edinburgh, during an exchange day on the future of cultural heritage trades, bringing together European heritage practitioners, students of 6 nationalities and heritage researchers around our partner partner Edinburgh World Heritage a list of proposals has been drawn up to bring out new training in line with the expectations of students and the needs of employers. From this meeting came the need to build a new pedagogical structure with innovative teachings and mobility redesigned to meet the new challenges of these deeply changing professions. The symposium on December 11th and 12th 2017 brought together a group of researchers, teachers and practitioners, around a new concept and a working methodology adapted for DYCLAM +: *the conflictualities approach* on the one hand, and the solutions of mediations and digital and human remedies on the other hand.

These meetings gave rise to intense debates between the managers of European heritage sites and UNESCO sites invited, including: Eugénia Apicella and Ferruccio Ferrigni in charge of the Cultural Landscape of the Cinque Terre; Adam Wilkinson, Director of Edinburgh World Heritage and the Europa Nostra Office (Associate Partner); Anca Mutean, representative of the Camera de Comert, Industrie si Agricultura Sibiu (associate partner), European Capital of Culture in 2007 and European Capital of Gastronomy in 2019. This group has launched a call for a real training of “project manager, safeguard, management and enhancement of heritage and cultural landscapes” integrating the new current issues. Private companies working for the safeguarding of digital heritage like ICONEM have alerted us to the need for training future professionals on these issues. ICOMOS and IUCN (International Union for the Conservation of Nature) have highlighted the urgency of training students in cultural diplomacy and negotiation to deal with new conflicts that increasingly affect, impact and involve cultural heritage (material, intangible, memories and landscapes).

Researchers, associations and politicians have mentioned the increase in “conflicts of interest” related to heritage and cultural issues: the tension between economic logic and the cultural imperative; between tourist pressure and the preservation of cultural property; between the instrumentalisation of identity and the universalist dimension of cultural heritage; between the scientific requirements of the historical approach and the emotional dimension of memory.

The partners of ProPEACE Project reported the necessity to train to the complexity of the heritage phenomenon which must now be thought of on a world scale. The themes and course projects mentioned in the first part of this report bear witness to this (See I. & II). This complexity also arises at the management level.

Here are the new issues facing cultural heritage that need to be thought and taught:

- ✓ ***the globalization of cultural tourism***
- ✓ ***the arrival on the market of new tourists***
- ✓ ***the increase of migrations***
- ✓ ***the negative effects of “overtourism”***
- ✓ ***the prevention against ideological destruction or against damage to the environment***
- ✓ ***the phenomenon of “gentrification” in urban centers***
- ✓ ***the competition between territories (within the same country)***
- ✓ ***the race for labels***
- ✓ ***the diplomatic and technical issues of restitution of cultural property to former colonized countries***
- ✓ ***the impact of digital and the internet in public practices and institutions in charge of heritage***
- ✓ ***the role of the European institutions in promoting the cultural heritage of Europe.***

A new type of heritage managers must be invented. New academic courses must be created.

A new type of heritage managers must be invented

At meetings organized in Saint-Étienne (11-12 December 2017) and in Cluj-Napoca (17-18 January 2018), the outlines of the DYCLAM + program were drawn. Through telephone exchanges and individual meetings, the associated partners and supporters validated the training program in relation to targeted and essential skills. We were able to benefit, in particular, from the experience and advice of Professor Laurier Turgeon, holder of the Chair of Intangible Heritage at Laval University, Quebec. Depending on the logic and the coherence of the project and based on the expertise of each, these meetings allowed to define the problems of course, the contribution and the specific role of each

partner within DYCLAM + as well as the resulting mobility path. This course begins with the Jean Monnet University (UJM), continues with the Polytechnic Institute of Tomar (IPT), then by the University Babes Bolyai (UBB); it concludes with an airlock at either Federico II University in Naples (UNINA) or an associate partner. Why? Because this construction allows a gradual increase in power in terms of learning. It allows a complete and in-depth study of the subject: from the definition of concepts (heritage, memory, conflictuality, cultural landscapes and cultural diplomacy) to safeguarding, rehabilitation, restitution, governance and management.

Proof of the reality of the integrated aspect of the training, the search for information on DYCLAM + as well as the application process will be done via a single website. It will also create a common visual identity. The application process is also carried out according to a procedure jointly defined by the partners. Students and scholars are selected according to common criteria and rating. For the students, for example, the selection criteria defined jointly by the partners are the academic merit, the professional project and the motivation, the professional experience and the previous mobility, but also the recommendations as well as the knowledge of other languages.

During the course of the program, from an administrative point of view, its governance is ensured by councils bringing together all the partners who, on an equal footing, will adopt the decisions: the Advisory Committee bringing together all the partners (principals and associates) and the Executive Council, of smaller composition. An integrated administrative operation will be organized by setting up a position of administrative and pedagogical coordinator within the UJM; it will provide the administrative link between the various partners in order, in particular, to manage and centralize pedagogical, administrative and logistical issues.

From an academic point of view, for each promotion, a privileged research problem will be defined by the partners of DYCLAM+ within the Advisory Committee. This will lead to a joint seminar in September of each year (“Joint DYCLAM + Week”), bringing together all the partners and, as far as possible, the associated partners. This theme will lead to a study applied through a collaborative project developed each semester to study this issue in the light of the local specificities (cultural, legal, disciplinary, political) of each partner country. The collaborative project, a real thread of the Master, requires not only to juxtapose the courses studied at each of the partners to adopt a global approach to the theme of the master. The “Joint DYCLAM + Week” will be the occasion of a scientific primer for the collaborative project (*See below*)

Training based on complementarity and the search for synergy

All the partners hosting the students during the first three semesters have adapted their course modules in order to be able to deliver a similar number of teaching units (5 Teaching Units-EU- or modules). The partners also agreed to apply the same number of ECTS per module. Student assessment methods have also been harmonized. The partners agreed to evaluate the courses in a professional perspective by adopting the following modalities: no standard table tests but reports, summary notes and oral presentations. Proof of a strong desire for integration and work in symbiosis of the entire Consortium, UNINA relocated courses will be delivered in semesters 1, 2 and 3 to allow students to choose the professionalization “Governance” (carried out by UNINA in semester 4) to obtain a complementary degree from UNINA in addition to the joint diploma DYCLAM +.

At the end of the training, a joint graduation, bringing together all the academic and professional partners will be organized. The fact of accompanying a joint diploma between partners DYCLAM + (UJM, IPT, UBB) is a complementary diploma of UNINA (professionalisation “Governance”), or a certificate of an associate partner (professionalization “Scientific expertise”) Reflects a true academic integration between the partners. After four semesters in Europe, the student obtains a joint degree from three institutions and a complementary parchment. It is a guarantee of a real recognition of the trainings delivered at each of the partners. A joint degree supplement will collect all data from the four semesters, including professionalization and work experience or research.

DYCLAM + proposes a joint training offer aimed at improving and reinforcing innovation and excellence in the management, enhancement and safeguarding of cultural heritage and landscapes by proposing an original methodological and pedagogical approach. The joint constitution of the program, its pedagogical offer and its mobility path allows DYCLAM + to propose a coherent mobility and a pedagogical declension integrating the complementary specificities of each partner and associated establishment to train the students to all the aspects inherent to the question. Our cohesion is a strength and an asset that students will benefit. By offering a training of excellence associating partners from all over the world, DYCLAM + is a promise of influence for the European Higher Education Area (EHEA). This collaborative spirit can only strengthen the cohesion and effectiveness of the European university teams that will benefit from the EHEA. The enlargement of the partnership (Babès Bolay University and many new associated partners) fully follows the objectives of the EHEA in the field of education. By integrating Eastern Europe into the Consortium, for example, DYCLAM + broadcasts the European idea more widely. Such training will strengthen not only student's skills but also the European citizens values defended in the EHEA. And she will participate in spreading the European idea in the world.