



Delft University of Technology

Decolonizing climate change–heritage research

Simpson, Nicholas P.; Clarke, Joanne; Orr, Scott Allan; Cundill, Georgina; Orlove, Ben; Fatorić, Sandra; Sabour, Salma; Khalaf, Nadia; Rockman, Marcy; More Authors

DOI

[10.1038/s41558-022-01279-8](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-022-01279-8)

Publication date

2022

Document Version

Final published version

Published in

Nature Climate Change

Citation (APA)

Simpson, N. P., Clarke, J., Orr, S. A., Cundill, G., Orlove, B., Fatorić, S., Sabour, S., Khalaf, N., Rockman, M., & More Authors (2022). Decolonizing climate change–heritage research. *Nature Climate Change*, 12(3), 210-213. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-022-01279-8>

Important note

To cite this publication, please use the final published version (if applicable).
Please check the document version above.

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download, forward or distribute the text or part of it, without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license such as Creative Commons.

Takedown policy

Please contact us and provide details if you believe this document breaches copyrights.
We will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Green Open Access added to TU Delft Institutional Repository

'You share, we take care!' - Taverne project

<https://www.openaccess.nl/en/you-share-we-take-care>

Otherwise as indicated in the copyright section: the publisher is the copyright holder of this work and the author uses the Dutch legislation to make this work public.

Decolonizing climate change-heritage research

Climate change poses a threat to heritage globally. Decolonial approaches to climate change-heritage research and practice can begin to address systemic inequities, recognize the breadth of heritage and strengthen adaptation action globally.

Nicholas P. Simpson, Joanne Clarke, Scott Allan Orr, Georgina Cundill, Ben Orlove, Sandra Fatorić, Salma Sabour, Nadia Khalaf, Marcy Rockman, Patricia Pinho, Shobha S. Maharaj, Poonam V. Mascarenhas, Nick Shepherd, Pindai M. Sithole, Grace Wambui Ngaruiya, Debra C. Roberts and Christopher H. Trisos

Climate change is an increasing focus of heritage research across Europe and North America, including identification of site-specific adaptation options for heritage preservation^{1,2}. In contrast, climate change research in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs) is limited due to systemic gaps in access to funding and its associated knowledge generation and thought leadership^{3,4}, and rarely concentrates on heritage^{5,6} (Fig. 1a). As heritage includes all the inherited

traditions, monuments, objects, places and culture, as well as contemporary activities, knowledge, meanings and behaviours that are drawn from them⁷, its preservation is crucial for all societies. Heritage can be tangible, in the case of objects or monuments, or intangible, including cultural practices and traditions, cultural identity and sense of place. Across LMICs, tangible and intangible heritage coexist, commonly without clear delineations between them.

Climate change exacerbates existing risks to heritage^{5,6}. This is particularly acute in LMICs where vulnerability to climate change is generally high and adaptation capacity low⁸, increasing the risk to heritage from climate hazards such as sea-level rise, flooding and wildfires^{9,10}. These physical risks are compounded by land-use change leading to socio-ecological tipping points and loss of livelihoods¹⁰. In particular, local and Indigenous knowledge (a form of intangible heritage) is impacted by climate




Fig. 1 | Colonial legacies affecting inequities in climate change-heritage research and practice. **a**, Number of English language papers on cultural heritage for different geographical regions and regions of first authors of climate change-heritage research. Concentrations of research focus on Europe and North America, while these regions also contain the highest number of first-author scholars producing this research. **b**, Global distribution of UNESCO World Heritage Sites per country shows concentrations of inscribed heritage in HICs, while former colonies have fewer UNESCO World Heritage Sites. **c**, Categorization of 27 World Heritage Sites in Mexico, showing the progressive marginalization of Indigenous cultures. Taken as a set, these World Heritage Sites form a narrative in which the Spanish conquest destroyed many Indigenous cultures and left the others as marginal and subordinated to European and cosmopolitan cultures, with little or no contribution to heritage. Visualization in **a** compiled from the supplemental information of ref. ⁵; map in **b** created from the UNESCO World Heritage List 2021³²; graph in **c** created from Mexican sites listed on the UNESCO World Heritage List 2021³².

Box 1 | Climate change and research on intangible cultural heritage

Djenné is a mud-built town situated on the Bani River within the Inland Niger Delta, Mali. Inhabited since the thirteenth century, its deep history and iconic earthen architecture form part of its 'Outstanding Universal Value', and its mud architecture is maintained by local men who belong to generations of masons. The re-plastering masonic traditions are necessary to ensure 'authenticity' — a requirement for Djenné's inscription on the World Heritage List¹⁴. Yet these intangible cultural practices have been increasingly difficult to maintain and were not adequately considered at the time of inscription. As a result, Djenné's continued inscription on the UNESCO World Heritage List is precarious, because climate change is exacerbating cultural vulnerabilities that threaten both the integrity of the earthen structures and the cultural practices that protect it¹⁴. Calcified fish bones are needed for good-quality mud, but lower rainfall has reduced mud quality for re-plastering by lowering river levels and reducing fish stocks¹⁴. Young masons have tried to find cheaper

building materials instead of buying the required but unaffordable high-quality mud for annual resurfacing. Reduced ability to effectively re-mud traditional buildings increases their exposure, but also interrupts traditional knowledge and practices tied to re-mudding performances. Continued loss of intangible cultural heritage will lead inevitably to the loss of the earthen structures that are its material expression. While colonial policies and their legacies have typically ignored intangible cultural heritage of host communities^{33,34}, such as Indigenous building practices, this case highlights the importance of understanding climate impacts holistically, those on both tangible and intangible heritage. Climate change–heritage research needs to recognize the need for contextually appropriate adaptation and protection of sites from a broad range of potential impacts, including their need for a just transition when heritage-dependent livelihoods are disrupted by climate change and heritage policies.

change through loss of livelihoods and migration^{11,12}, yet this knowledge is crucial for safeguarding other forms of heritage, such as traditional buildings and building methods^{13,14} (Box 1).

Research, data and knowledge barriers that undermine the potential for more informed responses to climate change also pose a risk to heritage^{3,15}. Development of robust climate change adaptation strategies for heritage is impaired by lack of up-to-date, adequately downscaled climate data and heritage-focused climate information services, particularly for LMICs, some of which are too small for current resolutions of global climate models, such as small island developing states¹⁶. Without usable data, it is highly challenging for LMICs to generate robust risk assessments and policy on how to best adapt and preserve vulnerable heritage, which leads to under-representation of climate risk to heritage in large climate assessments.

The prevailing conceptions and research foci in LMICs are dominated by the perspective of higher-income countries (HICs)^{17,18}, perpetuating a narrow, Eurocentric view, and mirroring colonial legacies that continue to shape priorities for climate research questions, funding and outputs globally^{3,19,20} (Fig. 1a,b). For example, climate adaptation funding for many vulnerable LMICs is

heavily dependent on international aid organizations that are commonly located in HICs³. This inevitably leads to an unequal balance in the types of heritage earmarked for research or development, with a bias towards heritage that is implicitly (if not explicitly) valued by those living in HICs while commonly side-lining pre-colonial heritage (as in the case of Mexico; Fig. 1c). The narrow concept of 'Outstanding Universal Value' as defined by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) for World Heritage Sites has been criticized in this regard²¹, because in LMICs, heritage with little or no global appeal frequently holds considerable local or Indigenous significance. Moreover, the continuing dichotomy between tangible and intangible heritage, employed by organizations such as UNESCO, is incompatible with non-Western heritage because it forces an unnatural dichotomy between belief systems and traditions, which often create value, or make sacred, places and things. By distinguishing between tangible and intangible heritage, these intricate social, ideological and cosmological relationships inherent in non-Western heritage are undermined⁶ (Fig. 1c and Box 2). Decolonizing climate change–heritage research is therefore important for heritage preservation because locally led research and a more equitable research

environment are needed to address the true potential loss and damage to heritage from climate change across LMICs^{10,11}.

Decolonize climate–heritage research

Despite recent interest in decolonizing heritage research^{19,22}, decolonial approaches are not yet widely established in climate change–heritage scholarship and practice. Recognizing that colonization led to Euro-American centrality, dispossession, racism and ongoing power imbalances in how climate change–heritage research is produced and used is an important first step^{20,23,24}. The next step is committing to actively undoing those systems and ways of thinking through transformations to agenda setting, funding, training, access to data and governance.

First, scholars and heritage practitioners across LMICs need the epistemic freedom to set their agendas for climate change–heritage research to address inequities in research leadership^{25,26} (Fig. 1). For this to happen, research agendas and funding, along with the policy agendas to which they are linked, need to be decentred from the HICs. Priorities for research and practice should be informed by Indigenous and local communities and should integrate their values, preferences and judgements with climate change risk and vulnerability assessments²⁷. For example, climate risk assessments need to integrate heritage values at local scales with scientific information on climate change.

Second, specific efforts will be required to train scholars in transdisciplinary research methodologies that accommodate multiple knowledges and world views in the formulation of research questions and the co-creation of solutions, including collaboration with Indigenous and local communities in equitable ways. Mentoring scholars from LMICs in writing for international peer-reviewed journals will help bring up a new generation of climate change–heritage scholars²⁸. Further, safeguards are needed to avoid exclusive and extractive research relationships and ensure research outcomes benefit local heritage communities and custodians, particularly where this knowledge can support adaptation responses to climate change.

Third, research findings and data need to be made accessible to heritage managers and practitioners in the regions that were the target of the research. At present, many online data repositories and journals are not freely available, and subscriptions are too expensive for many research institutions in LMICs. A tiered system of subscription costs based on ability to pay, or preferably open

Box 2 | Climate change–heritage research and Indigenous communities

In the Amazon, climate change impacts are experienced by Indigenous communities in dramatic and yet poorly understood ways. Impacts from heatwaves, precipitation variation, and more frequent and intense extreme weather events are material, including disruptions to food systems and local diets³⁵. Non-material impacts include losses of livelihoods, knowledge, place attachment, governance institutions, culture and identity, which compound material impacts to reduce resilience of Indigenous communities³⁶. The marginalization of Amazonian Indigenous communities is determined by these climate impacts, coupled with maladaptive responses and structural imbalances in power and resources^{36,37}. Yet, climate

change–heritage research on the Amazon faces severe funding crises and ongoing political opposition³⁸. This instability in research funding is likely to exacerbate existing knowledge gaps such as climate impacts on Indigenous communities' health³⁶. Lack of research funding also affects the visibility of Indigenous communities and the potential for mobilizing protective interventions³⁶. Resulting damages may enhance existing inequalities in the types of heritage recognized for protection. The Amazonian experience highlights the need for climate change–heritage scholars to propose new strategies for transdisciplinary research that adopts broad conceptions of heritage, includes protection of ecosystems and empowers Indigenous communities^{36,39,40}.

access, could make access to research more equitable.

Fourth, research on governance is also critically important for identifying enabling conditions for the transformation of colonial heritage governance arrangements that dislocated and disempowered local and Indigenous heritage governance structures^{7,29}. Multiple research disciplines, including social and political sciences, anthropology and climate research, need to provide critical research on what climate-resilient governance for heritage might look like when decolonized. Further, these disciplines need to collaborate to produce the kinds of actionable knowledge local governance would require, for example, downscaled and heritage-focused climate information available in local user languages to support multi-level decision-making³⁰.

Finally, nationally determined contributions are a mechanism by which every country can present its climate adaptation and mitigation plans to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. As such, these are bottom-up action plans for individual countries to tackle climate change. Although these documents are formatted with national priorities in mind, heritage should be included within suggested formats to catalyse climate change–heritage research globally.

International bodies concerned with heritage research and practice, including UNESCO, the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS), the International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property (ICCROM), and the IPCC, have increasingly recognized the importance of

climate change–heritage research to inform climate action within heritage practice globally³¹. Knowledge generated is essential to inform heritage-specific understanding of the impacts, vulnerability and risks from climate change, including loss and damage, and how such knowledge can inform adaptation and mitigation responses to climate change. It is therefore critical that transformations to climate change–heritage research agenda setting and funding, training, access to data, and governance overcome geographic, intersectional and distributional blind spots associated with colonial research legacies. In failing to actively transform in these ways, the climate change–heritage research community stands to further entrench these long-standing inequities, as well as exacerbate inequalities in heritage-relevant responses to climate change.

Data availability

The underlying dataset for Fig. 1a is available open access from the supplemental material in ref. 5, and datasets for Fig. 1b,c from the UNESCO World Heritage List 2021 in ref. 32.

Nicholas P. Simpson ¹✉, Joanne Clarke ²✉, Scott Allan Orr ³, Georgina Cundill ⁴, Ben Orlove ⁵, Sandra Fatorić⁶, Salma Sabour ⁷, Nadia Khalaf ⁸, Marcy Rockman ⁹, Patricia Pinho¹⁰, Shobha S. Maharaj¹¹, Poonam V. Mascarenhas¹², Nick Shepherd^{13,14}, Pindai M. Sithole¹⁵, Grace Wambui Ngaruiya¹⁶, Debra C. Roberts ^{17,18} and Christopher H. Trisos ^{1,19}

¹African Climate and Development Initiative, University of Cape Town, Cape Town, South Africa.

²School of Art, Media and American Studies, University of East Anglia, Norwich, UK. ³Institute for Sustainable Heritage, University College London, London, UK. ⁴International Development Research Centre, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada.

⁵School of International and Public Affairs, Columbia University, New York, NY, USA.

⁶Faculty of Architecture and the Built Environment, Delft University of Technology, Delft, The Netherlands.

⁷Faculty of Engineering and Physical Sciences, University of Southampton, Southampton, UK. ⁸Institute of Arab and Islamic Studies, University of Exeter, Exeter, UK.

⁹Department of Anthropology, University of Maryland, College Park, MD, USA. ¹⁰Institute for Advanced Studies, University of São Paulo, São Paulo, Brazil.

¹¹Caribbean Environmental Sciences and Renewable Energy Journal, Port-of-Spain, Trinidad and Tobago. ¹²Archinova Environs, Panaji, India.

¹³Department of Archaeology and Heritage Studies, Aarhus University, Aarhus, Denmark. ¹⁴University of Pretoria, Pretoria, South Africa. ¹⁵Africa Leadership and Management Academy, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa.

¹⁶Department of Plant Sciences, Kenyatta University, Nairobi, Kenya. ¹⁷Sustainable and Resilient City Initiatives Unit, eThekweni Municipality, Durban, South Africa. ¹⁸School of Life Sciences, University of KwaZulu-Natal, Durban, South Africa. ¹⁹Centre for Statistics in Ecology, Environment and Conservation, University of Cape Town, Cape Town, South Africa.

✉e-mail: nick.simpson@uct.ac.za; Joanne.Clarke@uea.ac.uk

Published online: 14 February 2022

<https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-022-01279-8>

References

1. Fatorić, S. & Biesbroek, R. *Climatic Change* **162**, 301–320 (2020).
2. Reimann, L., Vafeidis, A. T., Brown, S., Hinkel, J. & Tol, R. S. J. *Nat. Commun.* **9**, 4161 (2018).
3. Overland, I. et al. *Clim. Dev.* <https://doi.org/10.1080/17565529.2021.1976609> (2021).
4. North, M. A., Hastie, W. W., Craig, M. H. & Slotow, R. *Environ. Sci. Policy* **127**, 196–208 (2022).
5. Orr, S. A., Richards, J. & Fatorić, S. *Hist. Environ. Policy Pract.* **12**, 1–43 (2021).
6. Fatorić, S. & Seekamp, E. *Climatic Change* **142**, 227–254 (2017).
7. Brooks, N., Clarke, J., Ngaruiya, G. W. & Wangui, E. E. *Azania Archaeol. Res. Africa* **55**, 297–328 (2020).
8. Birkmann, J. et al. *Environ. Res. Lett.* **16**, 094052 (2021).
9. Oppenheimer, M. et al. in *Special Report on the Ocean and Cryosphere in a Changing Climate* (eds Pörtner, H. O. et al.) 321–445 (IPCC, WMO, 2019).
10. Ley, D. et al. in *Special Report on Global Warming of 1.5°C* (eds Masson-Delmotte, V. et al.) 338–348 (IPCC, WMO, 2018).
11. Boyd, E. et al. *One Earth* **4**, 1365–1370 (2021).
12. Cundill, G. et al. *Glob. Environ. Change* **69**, 102315 (2021).
13. Carmichael, B. et al. *Mitig. Adapt. Strateg. Glob. Change* **23**, 231–255 (2018).
14. Joy, C. J. *Mater. Cult.* **16**, 389–400 (2011).
15. Simpson, N. P. et al. *Nat. Clim. Change* **11**, 937–944 (2021).
16. Bordner, A. S., Ferguson, C. E. & Ortolano, L. *Glob. Environ. Change* **61**, 102054 (2020).
17. NOAA's ARK Project: *Global Climate Change Impact on Built Heritage and Cultural Landscapes* (University College London, 2021); <https://www.ucl.ac.uk/bartlett/heritage/research/projects/project-archive/noahs-ark-project>
18. Sabbioni, C., Brimblecombe, P. & Cassar, M. *The Atlas of Climate Change Impact on European Cultural Heritage: Scientific Analysis and Management Strategies* (Anthem Press, 2010).

19. *Decolonizing Heritage: ICCROM 31st General Assembly 2019* (International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property, 2019); <https://www.iccrom.org/resources/thematic-discussion-decolonizing-heritage>
20. Liboiron, M. *Nat. Geosci.* **14**, 876–877 (2021).
21. Tucker, H. & Carnegie, E. *Ann. Tour. Res.* **47**, 63–76 (2014).
22. Breunlin, R. *Genealogy* **4**, 95 (2020).
23. Wijsman, K. & Feagan, M. *Environ. Sci. Policy* **98**, 70–76 (2019).
24. Trisos, C. H., Auerbach, J. & Katti, M. *Nat. Ecol. Evol.* **5**, 1205–1212 (2021).
25. Ndlovu-Gatsheni, S. J. *Epistemic Freedom in Africa: Deprovincialization and Decolonization* (Routledge, 2018).
26. Schipper, E. L. F., Dubash, N. K. & Mulugetta, Y. *Climatic Change* **168**, 18 (2021).
27. Chirikure, S., Ndoro, W. & Deacon, J. in *Managing Heritage in Africa* 1st edn (eds Ndoro, W. et al.) 1–21 (Routledge, 2017).
28. *Rewriting World Archaeology: Dialogues on the Archaeology of the Global South* (The British Academy, 2021); <https://www.thebritishacademy.ac.uk/projects/rewriting-world-archaeology-dialogues-on-the-archaeology-of-the-global-south/>
29. Gahman, L., Penados, F. & Greenidge, A. *Soc. Mov. Stud.* **19**, 241–248 (2020).
30. Krauß, W. & Bremer, S. *Clim. Risk Manage.* **28**, 100221 (2020).
31. *International Co-Sponsored Meeting on Culture, Heritage and Climate Change* (IPCC, ICOMOS & UNESCO, 2021).
32. *World Heritage List* (UNESCO, accessed September 2021); <https://whc.unesco.org/en/list/>
33. Nursey-Bray, M., Palmer, R., Smith, T. F. & Rist, P. *Local Environ.* **24**, 473–486 (2019).
34. Pocock, C., Collett, D. & Baulch, L. *Int. J. Herit. Stud.* **21**, 962–982 (2015).
35. Zavaleta-Cortijo, C. et al. *Lancet Planet. Health* **4**, e381–e382 (2020).
36. Parry, L. et al. *Soc. Sci. Med.* **241**, 112448 (2019).
37. Zavaleta-Cortijo, C. et al. *PLoS ONE* **13**, e0205714 (2018).
38. Rodrigues, M. *Nature* **598**, 7881 (2021).
39. Fernández-Llamazares, Á. et al. *Reg. Environ. Change* **17**, 1673–1685 (2017).
40. Walker, R. T. *Environment* **63**, 15–25 (2021).

Acknowledgements

N.P.S. received financial support from the UK government's Foreign, Commonwealth & Development Office and the International Development Research Centre, Ottawa, Canada (grant number 109419-001). C.H.T. is supported by the FLAIR Fellowship Programme: a partnership between the African Academy of Sciences and the Royal

Society funded by the UK government's Global Challenges Research Fund. N.K. is supported by the Mapping Africa's Endangered Archaeological Sites and Monuments project funded by Arcadia — a charitable fund of Lisbet Rausing and Peter Baldwin. S.S. is funded by the Leverhulme Trust Doctoral Training Scheme, hosted by Southampton Marine and Maritime Institute at the University of Southampton.

Author contributions

N.P.S. and J.C. were responsible for conceptualization and administration of the project; N.P.S., J.C., S.A.O., G.C., B.O., S.F., S.S., N.K., M.R., P.P., S.S.M., P.V.M., N.S., P.M.S., G.W.N., D.C.R. and C.H.T. were responsible for resources and wrote the original draft; N.P.S., J.C., S.A.O., G.C. and B.O. reviewed and edited the manuscript; and C.H.T. was responsible for funding acquisition. N.P.S. and J.C. contributed equally.

Competing interests

The authors declare no competing interests.