

OFAJ
DFJW

D DOCUMENTA
CENTAR ZA SUOČAVANJE S PROŠLOŠĆU
CENTER FOR DEALING WITH THE PAST

YIHR

**CENTRE
ANDRÉ MALRAUX**
www.malraux.ba

**Platform for trans-European exchange and cooperation
“Dealing with difficult pasts in the Western Balkans and Western Europe”
Third international workshop and study trip
France, 7-13 October 2012**

Organized by the Youth Initiative for Human Rights,
Documenta-Centar for Dealing with the past, the French-German Youth Office
and the Centre André Malraux Sarajevo

In cooperation with :

Historial of the Great War in Péronne, Mémorial de la Shoah Paris,
Centre de la Mémoire d’Oradour-sur-Glane, Direction Régionale de la Jeunesse,
des Sports et de la Cohésion Sociale du Limousin

centre de la **mémoire**
ORADOUR-SUR-GLANE
village martyr

HISTORIAL
DE LA
GRANDE
GUERRE
PERONNE
S O M M E

Liberté • Égalité • Fraternité
RÉPUBLIQUE FRANÇAISE
MINISTÈRE DES SPORTS,
DE LA JEUNESSE,
DE L'ÉDUCATION
POPULAIRE ET DE
LA VIE ASSOCIATIVE

**Mémorial
de la SHOAH**
Musée,
Centre
de documentation
juive
contemporaine

FINAL REPORT

With the support of:
CCFD-Terre Solidaire, French-German Youth Office,
French Embassy in Croatia, French Embassy in Kosovo

Liberté • Égalité • Fraternité
RÉPUBLIQUE FRANÇAISE
AMBASSADE DE FRANCE
AU KOSOVO

Liberté • Égalité • Fraternité
RÉPUBLIQUE FRANÇAISE
AMBASSADE DE FRANCE
EN CROATIE

**CCFD
TERRE
SOLIDAIRE**

Dealing with difficult pasts in the Western Balkans and Western Europe
– Platform for Trans-European exchange and cooperation
Third international workshop and study trip, France 7-13 October 2012

Final Report - Content :

- A. Executive Summary
- B. Detailed Report :
 - 1. General framework
 - 2. Aims of the project 2012
 - 3. Participants
 - 4. Project content and development
 - 5. Results and evaluation by the participants
 - 6. Future perspectives
- C. Annexes :
 - 1. Program 2012
 - 2. Participants 2012
 - 3. General information on the organizers / grant applicants
 - 4. Contact coordination team
 - 5. Summaries Working Groups 12.10.2012

A. Executive Summary:

1. *The Trans-European platform “Dealing with difficult pasts in the Western Balkans and Western/Central Europe” brings together initiatives in the field of dealing with difficult pasts (wars, dictatorship) from different countries of Western/Central Europe and the Western Balkans. Aims of this informal platform are to deepen mutual knowledge, exchange experiences, build capacities, facilitate contacts and realize common projects, especially in direction of young people. Its general purpose is to contribute to the integration of the countries of the former Yugoslavia into a common European civil society and memory space.*
2. *The platform is organized around an annual study trip and workshop. The initiative was launched in June 2010 with a first workshop in Sarajevo, and continued in 2011 with a workshop in Prijedor, and a study trip to Jasenovac, Donja Gradina and Vukovar. After two years in the Western Balkans, the third edition of the study trip and workshop took place from 7th to 13th October 2012 in France. The program included visits of the following sites: the battlefields of the Somme and the “Historial de la Grande Guerre” in Péronne, related to the First World War; the “Mémorial de la Shoah” in Paris and Drancy, related to the history of genocide of the Jews during the Second World War ; and the village and Memorial Centar of Oradour-sur-Glane, where 642 civilians have been massacred by an SS-division in 1944. Except for the visits, we furthermore organized different sessions of presentations, exchange and group work.*
3. *40 persons participated at the study trip and workshop: representatives of memorial centers, historical museums, NGOs and other initiatives from Western/Central Europe and from the Western Balkans, which are acting practically in the field of dealing with*

the past. 26 of the 40 persons also participated in 2010 and/or 2011, while 14 persons participated for the first time. Participants from Kosovo, the Netherlands and Greece were members of the group for the first time.

- 4. Visits to different sites left very strong impressions on the participants. For the Historial of the Great War in Péronne and the monuments of the battlefields of the Somme the most striking elements were the multiperspectivity approach, the de-glorification of the war and the emphasis on human suffering. Memorial de la Shoah in Paris raised more controversial reactions, especially concerning the question of definition of genocide which provoked intense discussions within the group. The visit to Oradour-sur-Glane was seen by a majority of the participants as the highlight of the program, especially through its unique combination of the destroyed village as authentic site, the new village just nearby and the Memory Center with its exhibition, together with meeting one of the survivors of the massacre and a historian who contextualized what the group had seen.*
- 5. The other activities of the program were also mostly seen as very stimulating and useful: an overview-presentation about memory cultures in France, an exchange on the (non-)evolution of memory cultures in the other represented countries, and the presentation of projects and activities realized by the participants. On the last day, working groups were formed in relation to the ideas and needs of the participants, who discussed topics they wanted to deepen, for example about the role of new technologies in memorialization processes, or planning future activities, for example in the framework of the anniversary of the First World War in 2014.*
- 6. The general feedback on the program and the organization was very positive. What was especially emphasized were: the choice of the visited places; the balance between visits, presentations and group work; the richness and diversity of the content; the quality of discussions and exchanges within the group; the good logistical organization. As critical point some participants raised time management, estimating that the program was too full.*
- 7. As most important results of the study visit and workshop the participants emphasized in their evaluations: what they had learned about memory cultures in France and about dealing with the past in general; how much what they had discovered stimulated their reflection and could be useful for their own work; the establishment and deepening of valuable contacts in the perspective of further networking and cooperation. Once again, the program illustrated how stimulating it can be for participants of the Western Balkans and Western Europe to explore together, in a common group, memory sites and to work together on topics linked to memorialization challenges they are facing in their countries.*
- 8. For next year, it is planned to organize the annual workshop and study trip in Berlin-Brandenburg and on the German-Polish border, in October 2013. In January 2013, a three-days strategy meeting will be organized in order to evaluate the first two years of the platform and to develop a strategy and action plan for the next years, with the aim to strengthen this initiative and to ensure its sustainable development.*

B. Detailed report

1. The general framework

Dealing with the past (DwP) is a very sensitive issue in the countries of the former Yugoslavia, as the wounds of the wars of the 1990s are still fresh and linked with often conflicting memories. In Western and Central Europe, although there has been no war in the last sixty years, memory questions often also remain sensitive, for example concerning the Second World War and the crimes linked to communism or colonialism. Even if each country has its specific situation and if the distance of war differs in Western/Central Europe and the Western Balkans, a lot of questions are nevertheless similar: How to deal with difficult past(s)? How to face the reluctance of people to deal with the past? What is the place and the role of memory sites in DwP-processes? What are possibilities and challenges of pedagogical and educational approaches at and around this kind of places, especially for young people? To what extent can memory sites bring conflicting memories together? If international cooperation in the field of DwP is quite well developed within the EU, exchanges in this field within SEE and also between SEE and the EU-countries are quite rare. This mutual absence of relations and knowledge is reflecting the still existing gaps between the countries of former Yugoslavia and between these countries and the rest of Europe. Also in the perspective of the European integration of the countries of former Yugoslavia, it appears to be urgent to create regular opportunities for initiatives committed to constructive DwP to meet, learn from each other and develop common activities. This inclusion of initiatives from former Yugoslavia in a larger European context and the sharing of Western European experiences, especially from France and Germany, must be seen as contribution to the strengthening of cooperation and peace-building processes in still very divided societies of the former Yugoslavia, and also to the development of a common European memory and civil society.

In June 2010, a workshop in Sarajevo, gathering 25 representatives of memorials and NGOs working on DwP in BiH, Croatia, Serbia, France and Germany, illustrated how stimulating and useful a trans-European exchange on these issues can be and how much it would make sense to develop such exchange on a more regular basis. The second workshop was organized in October 2011 in Prijedor in BiH, this time gathering 40 people from seven European countries, and which was preceded by a two-day study trip allowing for more field visits.¹ The feedback was again very positive and in order to make the work more sustainable, the group decided to create an informal platform of interested organizations and to organize this platform around an annual study trip and workshop. After two years in the Western Balkans, it was decided that the annual workshop and study trip in 2012 should take place in France, in cooperation with the “Historial of the Great War” in Péronne, the “Mémorial de la Shoah” in Paris, and the “Centre de la Mémoire” in Oradour-sur-Glane.

The gatherings of the first two years already led to the organization of other activities, for example: In February 2011, the Max-Mannheimer-Studienzentrum organized, together with the Centre Malraux Sarajevo, a study trip to Dachau and Munich for organizations from Prijedor and Srebrenica ; *Documenta* and the *Institut für Angewandte Geschichte* organized together in Zagreb in March 2012 an international school on commemorative cultures; YIHR

¹ During the workshop and study trip 2011, filmmaker Cazim Dervisevic recorded a documentary film under the title « What kind of Memorials do we want to build ? » (2012, 56 minutes). Extracts of the film can be seen on youtube:

http://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PLLUcMDUfpGlpWu11L2Nzbyul5GfqHagKg&feature=view_all

Serbia, ALD Osijek, the *DRJCS* Limoges and the *Max-Mannheimer-Studienzentrum* started in 2012 a seminar cycle for students from France, Germany, Croatia and Serbia on war crimes trials, with a first seminar in Dachau, Nürnberg and The Hague in June 2012, and the second seminar in Croatia and Serbia scheduled for 2013.

2. Aims of the platform, workshop and study trip 2012:

General purpose:

To bring together initiatives in the field of dealing with difficult pasts (wars, dictatorships) from different countries of Western/Central Europe and the Western Balkans which are active in the field of memory work, especially towards young people and around memory sites, in order to promote a continuous work of exchange and cooperation. The overall aim is to contribute to cooperation and understanding processes in Europe and especially with and within South Eastern Europe, and to the integration of the countries of the former Yugoslavia into a common European civil society and memory space.

Specific aims :

- To develop and deepen the mutual knowledge about the DwP-initiatives and the memory-landscapes of the involved European countries; to learn about dealing-with-the-past challenges in France, to explore Péronne, the Mémorial de la Shoah and Oradour-sur-Glane as places of memory and commemoration, and to give through the French examples incentives for memorialisation-processes in the Western Balkans
- To facilitate the exchange of experiences and of know-how about dealing-with-the-past challenges, especially in the field of memory sites and of the work with young people; to provide a space for participants and organisations to reflect about their work
- To provide a space to establish contacts for future cooperation of the participating initiatives and to work on common activities and projects on a multilateral or bilateral level
- To learn about similarities and differences in “dealing with the past”-processes throughout Europe (Intercultural Learning), and to stimulate the reflection on the question to what extent and under which conditions memory sites can bring together different and conflicting memories.

3. Participants:

As in the two previous years, the participants of the workshop and the study trip were representatives of memorial centers, historical museums, NGOs and other organizations/initiatives from Western/Central Europe and from the Western Balkans, acting practically in the field of dealing with the past, especially around memory sites and towards young people.

All in all, 40 persons took part in the program, out of which 26 also participated in 2010 and/or 2011, while 14 persons participated for the first time.

Concerning the countries, the group included 12 persons from BiH, 5 from Croatia, 4 from Serbia, 2 from Kosovo, 7 from France, 7 from Germany, 1 from the Netherlands, 1 from Belgium, and 1 person from Greece. For the first time, the group therefore included participants from Kosovo, the Netherlands and Greece, while the number of persons from Serbia increased from one person (in 2010 and 2011) to four persons.

4. Content and development of the program:

The program was structured in two complementary parts: the study trip in and around Paris on the 8th and 9th October, and the workshop in Limoges on the 10th-12th October. Concerning the visited sites, the program focused on three particularly important and instructive memory sites, not only for the French and European history of the 20th century, but also regarding the challenges of memorialisation-processes:

- Historial of the Great War in Péronne and battlefields of the Somme
- Memorial de la Shoah in Paris and Drancy
- Village and Memorial-Centar of Oradour-sur-Glane

The visits of Péronne and of the Mémorial de la Shoah took place during the study trip on the 8th and 9th October ; the visit of Oradour-sur-Glane took place the second day of the workshop in Limoges. Different sessions of presentations, exchange and group work were furthermore organized during the workshop.

4.1. The visits of Péronne, Mémorial de la Shoah and Oradour

4.1.1. Péronne: Historial of the Great War and battlefields of the Somme

Situated in the town of Péronne, in the north of Paris, the “Historial of the Great War” is related to the First World War and the battle of the Somme in 1916, where British and French troops on the one hand and German troops on the other hand fought one of the most murderous battles of the First World War, with 300.000 dead and missing soldiers. The Historial is situated within one of the most impressive memory landscapes in Europe: the former battlefields of the Somme, stretching over 30km, are covered with more than 400 different cemeteries, memorials and monuments related to the battle.

The program started in the Historial, which was opened in 1992 and constitutes a unique memory site in Europe as it has been developed together by the British, French and German experts. The curator Frederick Hadley guided the group through the permanent exhibition which is focusing on social and cultural dimensions of the war and which includes French, British and German perspectives on the realities of the war. The group visited also the current temporary exhibition which is dedicated to the missing British soldiers of the Somme. After the visits, Christophe Thomas from the Educational Service of the Historial presented some pedagogical activities organized by the Historial for school children, which aim to give an universal vision of the war and a critical perception of war propaganda. After lunch, the group went to see two sites of the former battlefields of the Somme from 1916: the South-African Memorial in Longueval, dedicated to thousands of South African soldiers who died there, and the Thiépval Arch dedicated to “The Missing of the Somme”, the 70.000 British soldiers who died in the battle and whose bodies were never found or identified.

In the feedback to these visits, the main aspects which were emphasized by the participants of the group were the choices of multiperspectivity and of deglorification of the war, linked to the dimensions of suffering which were also seen through the monuments. *“Excellent concept of the museum. The exhibition is set to present suffering of all involved armies. It seems to me that human being is in the focus of everything. The battlefield i.e. and tombstones as well as the central monument with engraved names of unidentified ones indicates the magnitude of suffering.”* *“The Great War Museum impressed me very much with*

its approach – excellent combination of documents, facilities, historical interpretation, cultural context and artistic contribution to traumatic events.” “The exhibition on missing persons was striking for me, as all stories are personalised, so the visitor feels the exhibition is telling a story about real people, not mere numbers.” “The Historial is for me a model of compared history and museography. The decision to exhibit mainly objects helps to better understand the ‘big history’. The approach of the daily life of the soldiers and civilians is necessary to better understand what has been World War One. The visits of the French-British and South-African monuments illustrated the immensity of the disaster (the thousands of dead) and created among us a big empathy.”

4.1.2. The Shoah Memorial in Paris and Drancy

The « Memorial to the Unknown Jewish Martyr » was opened in 1956 in Paris as the first Memorial in Europe related to the genocide of the Jews during the Second World War ; it was renewed and enlarged in 2005, becoming the “Mémorial de la Shoah” which is *today the largest research, information and awareness-raising center in Europe on the history of the genocide of the Jews*. The group first had a guided visit of the permanent exhibition on the history of the Jews in France before and during the Second World War, the crypt and the wall with the names of the 76.000 deported and exterminated Jews from France. After this, Jacques-Olivier David from the Educational Department presented the pedagogical activities space; he thereby explained the *historical* approach of the Memorial: the aim of the Memorial is to insist mainly on the historical explanation how it came to the destruction of the European Jews, and not so much to draw moral conclusions from it. After lunch, historian Georges Bensoussan gave a lecture about “The Shoah between history and memory”, where he placed the Shoah in the framework of global history of the world, emphasizing how much the Shoah must be seen as a completion of the Modern history and not as an anomaly, and that the Shoah occupies a specific place in the history of mass murder and genocides. We finally went to the memory site of Drancy, the former detention camp in the North of Paris from where most of the Jews of France were deported between 1942 and 1944 and which was run by the French police which collaborated with the German occupier. A new Memorial had just been opened there a few weeks before, in immediate neighborhood to the buildings which had been used as camp and which are now inhabited: we visited the inside of the Memorial, and then Alban Perrin presented us the outside monuments nearby the buildings, explaining through this the history of the camp and how long it had taken the French state and society to acknowledge its own role in the deportation and destruction of the Jews from France.

The visit of the Shoah Memorial raised contradictory reactions. On the one hand, there have been very positive reactions to the Memorial: *“Very detailed information on the rise of Nazism and growth of anti-Semitism since the 1930’s ; personal stories of victims present in all parts of the exhibition ; attention given to people who helped victims, and most of all presentation of Jews not only as victims of exodus, but as ordinary people before and after the war, with their simple ordinary lives.” “I am impressed with the approach of Shoah museum which we saw during our visit. As pedagogic and historiographic approaches in my country (BiH) remained on the level of last century, before 1992, it was interesting to see the way in which employees of the museum teach about the Shoah and problems they are coming across in that process. Therefore, I listened to a presentation of Jacques-Olivier David very*

attentively, because in addition to information on work of Pedagogic Department it provided us with information on problems in French historiography and education system.” The Drancy memorial site was seen as especially interesting: “Drancy is a quite fascinating place: this is the first former internment camp I saw which is today inhabited.” “The Drancy memorial for me as an architect and planner was the most exciting experience. The used and inhabited site together with the new exhibition-center by Diener/Diener was very convincing and highly authentic. Memorials as part of the day-to-day life in a city – this is a very striking example of that!”

On the other hand, several participants communicated their irritations, regretting for example that the exhibition is focusing on the genocide of the Jews and not also on the Roma, and more generally about the general message of the Memorial: *“I was a bit puzzled by the ambiguity of the message. Despite claiming being purely historical, memory and even activism are at stake and that blurs the message a little bit.”* Particular negative reactions raised the answer of Georges Bensoussan in the discussion after his presentation, when he was asked about his opinion on what had happened in Srebrenica in 1995: while he admitted that he did not know much about Srebrenica, he nevertheless emphasized that in his opinion it did not fulfill his criteria of the definition of a genocide. This shocked especially some participants from Bosnia and Herzegovina, and unfortunately this question came at the very end of the discussion, so that the group did not have time to discuss about it with Georges Bensoussan. As there was a big need to talk about this critical incident, we came back to it later in the workshop.

4.1.3. Oradour-sur-Glane

Oradour-sur-Glane, in South Western France, is the place of the most notorious single massacre of civilians in occupied France during the Second World War: the 10th June 1944, the SS-division “Das Reich” killed 642 inhabitants, men, women and children. After the liberation of France, the French government decided to leave the destroyed village as it was and to declare the “Martyr-village” a historical monument, which is as it remains until today. After the war, the French government also decided to construct a new village, a “new Oradour”, just 500 meters from the destroyed one. In 1999, between the destroyed and the new village, a “Memory Center” was opened, including an exhibition on the Third Reich, the Second World War and the history of the massacre of Oradour and its aftermath, and also an educational service dedicated to the 30.000 school pupils visiting the site every year.

The visit of Oradour-sur-Glane by the group, the 11th October, took place in four steps: first the group discovered the “Centre de la Mémoire” and its permanent exhibition: the exhibition insists much on the history of the Third Reich, then puts in parallel the bloody path of the SS-division das Reich and the peaceful life of the village Oradour-sur-Glane, which lived outside of the war until the 10th of June 1944; it then tells the tragedy of the 10th June, puts it in parallel with other massacres in Europe during WWII and raises the question what we should learn about it. In the second step, the group visited the destroyed village with the different execution sites, a cemetery and a crypt which was build in the 1950s where today are exhibited objects of daily life which had been found in the destroyed village. During this visit we also heard about the problem of conservation of the ruins and the efforts which are made to avoid that they fall apart due to time and weather conditions. In the third step we met Robert Hébras, who is one of the six persons who survived the massacre of June 1944. He

told us about how he experienced the 10th June and how he survived, how he had been living since with the memory of that day and how much he was disappointed by the way the French state and judicial system dealt later on with the massacre. In the fourth step we went to the new village which has been built 500 meters away from the destroyed one. The mayor received the group in the city hall where he explained how he has been, for ten years, developing contacts with Germany, despite the criticism of the victims association. After this, one of his assistants showed us the village, explaining what had been the principles of reconstruction and how it was to live nearby a place filled with so much memory. To put the whole day in its context, the next day in the morning, we invited historian Pascal Plas who presented to us how, until today, the memory of Oradour-sur-Glane remains a very sensitive topic within France, as among the SS-division figured also several soldiers from Alsace in Eastern France which had been incorporated by force (“malgré-nous”) in the SS-division, and the memory of the event until today provokes tense relationships between Alsace and Limousin. In 1953, during a trial in Bordeaux 12 of these *malgré-nous* were condemned, but facing the protests of the Alsace region, the French government decided to amnesty them, what in turn raised heavy protests in the Limousin-region and created a lasting resentment against the French state in this region. Pascal Plas also explained how much this “failed appointment with the Justice” in 1953 made it until today difficult to develop clear memory and historiography discourses about the massacre of Oradour.

For many of the participants (more than 50% of the evaluation sheets), the visit of Oradour constituted “*the most impressing/important/interesting moment of the week.*” “*For me, the visit to Oradour was the most complete and of the best quality in terms of offered content. It left a strong impression on me. At one location we saw different forms of memorialisation which create a unique entity – authentic location, museum with all necessary information, well structured and easy to follow; and a survivor of the massacre. The visit to new Oradour and local authorities provided a good insight in current position of the town.*” “*In this combination of destroyed village - new village - Memory Centar, it is one of the most fascinating and stimulating places I have ever seen for any reflection about dealing with the past. Walking through the ruins of the destroyed village is an unforgettable experience. The Memory Centar illustrates that the debate between perpetrator-centered and victim-centered-approaches can be futile: really excellent how the path of the SS-Division Das Reich from Eastern Europe to France is presented in the corridor on one wall, and on the other wall the peaceful life in Oradour-village during the war – until both sides met on the 10th June 1944 in the massacre. Seeing the new Oradour illustrated how life can continue despite and with such a past and neighborhood. The presentation of the mayor of the new Oradour was a performance in itself; despite many rhetorics it illustrated the importance of political will and courage in order to foster reconciliation without denying what happened.*” Within the visit, the encounter with the survivor Robert Hébras was several times mentioned as a special highlight: “*This was the first time for me to meet a witness of such tragic event from the Second World War.*” “*The talk with the witness of Oradour was the most impressive moment for me. It is amazing how that man survived that massacre and also all this time that has passed. I don’t think I’ll ever have such an experience in my life again.*” “*The testimony of R. Hebras was very impressive, maybe the most important moment of the week. From his story we have learned about history (what happened) and about dealing with the past (need to pass*

the message to others, self healing, commemoration of the beloved ones), and about reconciliation (relation with Germans as perpetrators)." The presentation of and discussion with the historian Pascal Plas was also very positively highlighted: *"This was a very useful contextualisation of what we had seen and heard the day before; it put a new light on problems related to dealing with difficult past in France."* *"Very useful presentation which filled the gaps after visit to Oradour, which we could not get during the visit. Only after this presentation it was clear how complex the story of Oradour memorialisation is. Unusually wide views for a historian."* *"Extremely interesting presentation which provided me information on complexity of interaction of politics, judiciary system, commemoration and writing of history."*

4.2. Other points of the program

4.2.1. Feedback concerning the study visit:

We started the workshop in Limoges with a feedback-round concerning the study trip. We first asked the participants to formulate one question or impression for each of the both sites we had visited, and to read them in the plenary session. The aim was to get through this a general idea about questions which were left open or which the visit had raised, and impressions that the visits had triggered. Concerning the questions related to Péronne, Frederick Hadley, the curator of the Historial, who participated also at the workshop, could later answer most of the questions. Unfortunately, nobody of the Memorial de la Shoah had been able to join the group in Limoges. But we decided, through small groups, to give the group the opportunity to discuss about the definition of genocide which had provoked so much reactions the day before. In small groups, the participants also discussed the question to what extent what they had seen and heard during these two days could be useful for their own work.

4.2.2. Presentation on the evolution of public remembrance of wars in France

The first day of the workshop in Limoges, Nicolas Moll made a general overview-lecture, illustrated by concrete examples especially of Monuments, with the title: "From consensus to controversy: Public remembrance in France of the First World War, the Second World War and the Algerian War". He explained that in all three cases, there had first been a period of public consensus – the memory of heroic-mourning for the First and Second World War, the silence for the Algerian War – and that then, after two or three decades, evolutions occurred: the emergence of alternative memories, claiming for their official recognition, including partially the emergence of a « negative remembrance » challenging the patriotic-heroic remembrance. Since the 1990s, the partial integration of alternative and negative memories into the official remembrance can be observed on the one hand, and ongoing controversies implying politicians, historians, civil society actors, intellectuals, especially around the Second World War and the Algerian War on the other hand.

Here some extracts from the evaluation sheets concerning this presentation: *"Impressive overview, clear, concise, with examples."* *« Useful and well structured presentation with lots of new information especially in terms of memory culture in context of Algerian war. The presentation contributed to a better understanding of the complexity of*

memory culture in France.” “*I found this presentation very interesting since I did not know much about conflicting memories in France.*” “*Excellent! Systematic and precise overview of a complex topic, indispensable to better understand what we had seen the two days before and in order to have a common ground for further discussion.*”

4.2.3. What’s new in our countries?

This year’s study visit took place in France and the content was mainly related to explore dealing-with-the-past-processes in this country, but as the two years before, the workshop was also thought to be a possibility of exchange about other countries, and what the current evolutions in each of the countries related to the questions of dealing with the past are. “What is (not) new in our countries? Current challenges in the field of memorialization and dealing with the past in Western Europe and in South Eastern Europe” was the title of this part of the program. The participants of each country were invited to gather and to choose three concrete events through which they would illustrate to other participants current challenges and debates in their country. After the preparation in the country-groups, each group presented in the plenary the results. Not all groups were able to agree on three events and talked about the difficulties to find a common ground of discussion. In general the participants from the Western Balkans insisted on how difficult the situation remains in the field of dealing with past in their countries, especially in the sense of positive progresses regarding critical DWP approaches which are facing strong reluctance from the state and big parts of the societies. Especially in Serbia and Bosnia and Herzegovina a self-critical approach of dealing with the past is confronted to important institutional blockades, while in Kosovo and Croatia some movement could be observed lately on the institutional level. The most controversial topics in Serbia and Croatia were related to the history and memory of the Second World War, while in Kosovo and Bosnia and Herzegovina they concern the wars of the 1990s. Concerning the Western European countries, the participants mentioned the opening of new memory sites (for example in Berlin for the Roma and Sinti victims of the Third Reich) and stretched how much the Second World War remains in the center of attention and debates. Another topic which has drawn more public attention lately in France, Belgium and the Netherlands, but not in Germany, is the colonial history of these countries, with debates about the responsibilities for committed crimes in the colonies.

Concerning this item, here are some extracts from the evaluation sheets: “*Very interesting session, as it is difficult to follow up all events taking place in other countries.*” “*It was good to have a review of events to actually get picture on how much has happened in the meantime.*” “*It was interesting to participate in the process of selection of significant events in my country (Croatia), because I figured out that even in such small group it was difficult to agree about the final list. Significant influence of political stands on interpretation and valorisation of recent events was noticeable.*” Some expressed some dissatisfaction with the way of discussion within their country-group: “*I think that not all group members understood the topic in the same way, so we ended up with an extensive list of events, which from my perspective were not that relevant.*”

4.2.4. Film screenings

In order to give the possibility not only to speak about the general situation, but also to make acquaintance with concrete projects realized by different organizations, the participants were invited to select short film screenings or presentations about their work and to show them to the group. In this framework were shown film-screenings about the covering of war crimes trials by BIRN, the virtual museum of the siege of Sarajevo planned by YIHR, the common visits of ex-combatants of the Yugoslav wars organized by the Center for Non-Violent Action, the common history-textbook project realized by the *Center for Democratisation and Reconciliation in South Eastern Europe*, the work of the *Institute for Applied History*, as well as power point presentations about the Memory-walk-project which Anne Frank House of Amsterdam realized in Berlin, the project “War children – life paths until today” of the Anne Frank Center in Berlin, and about the establishment of a new Memorial in Prijedor where the organization *Izvor* was involved.

The majority of the group found these film screenings and presentations very useful and informative. *“Very useful part of the program. This was an opportunity to get familiar with activities of other organizations/institutions. This is also a precondition for establishing of contacts and exchange of experience.”* *“Good method to learn about activities, organizations, working methods and participants of the seminar.”* *“Indispensable. It really gives life to projects and prompted new discussions.”* However, several persons regretted that too many projects had been shown or that it was shown too late in the evening, after a long day, where the concentration was not at its best anymore: *“Too long, content is interesting, format should be reconsidered.”* *“Important, but too late after a long day.”*

4.2.5. Working groups:

The third and last day of the workshop, on the 12th of October, was mainly dedicated to the deepening of certain topics and to the planning of future activities. Working groups were formed according to the needs and wishes expressed by participants related to their ideas or future common activities. Following groups were constituted:

- 2014 – anniversary of the First World War
- Memorialization and new technologies
- Dialogue between different generations
- International activities in Prijedor
- Memorialization and transformation of memory cultures
- Workshop 2013 in Germany

The groups worked for several hours and then presented their results in the plenary. Some of the groups were more like discussion groups, deepening a topic without proposals at the end, while other were more oriented on the planning of future activities. The working group “2014-2018” discussed the anniversary of the First World War and what kind of pedagogical activities could be organized in the framework of this platform on this occasion ; some concrete proposals were developed around a comparative approach of the First World War, the Second World War and the Yugoslav Wars in the 90s. The working group “Memorialization and new technologies” discussed how new technologies can be used as tools for memorialization processes, as an alternative or in addition to classical memory approaches as physical monuments, and pointed out advantages and disadvantages that new

technologies can present in this framework. The working group “Dialogue between generations” developed a project idea called “17-17-17”, organized around talks in BiH in small groups between people of three generations: generation that was seventeen during the Second World War, generation that was seventeen during the war in Bosnia and generation that is seventeen today. The working group “Prijeđor” developed a proposal how international experts could be involved in order to develop a consultation process about memorialization in Prijeđor, involving stakeholders from victim associations and the municipality. The group “Memorialization and transformation” discussed about the challenges that the transformation of memory cultures in the countries of the former Yugoslavia are raising since the 1990s, and stretched the importance of a multidisciplinary and critical approach in the analysis of memorialization-processes. One working group finally worked on the edition of the study trip and workshop in 2013, which is planned for October 2013 in Berlin-Brandenburg and at the German-Polish border, and developed a list of possible topics to be treated, for example: dealing with GDR history; change of memory culture after 1989; German-Polish relations and the issue of dealing with the history of expulsions; remembering minorities' suffering, like Roma and Sinti; educational approaches and artistic approaches to memory.

The more detailed summaries of the working groups can be found in annex 6.

Mostly positive feedback about these working groups appeared in evaluation sheets: *“Constructive, especially because they were formed around topics that arose during the week.” “Very motivating. It is a way to create a dynamics for the future.” “Our working group finalized its work with very concrete ideas, future steps and plans for the future. There is a solid potential and realistic ground to develop these ideas into a specific project”.* *“Very useful and interesting, as it carries a great potential for concrete steps and actions.”* Some persons were more skeptical concerning the implementation of the developed ideas: *“Still very theoretical; I hope the discussions will result in real projects, at least some of them.”*

4.2.6. Evaluation

The workshop ended with a general evaluation, mainly through a questionnaire which focused, on one hand, on individual points of the program and on the other hand on more general questions, for example about what the participants had learned during the week. The results of the evaluation concerning specific parts of the program have been presented above; the results concerning the more general questions will be presented in the following part.

5. Results and evaluation by the participants

5.1. General impression on the program:

The general feedback on the program and its organization has been very positive: *“Same as in previous years, this study visit and workshop were well organised – with well balanced proportion of study trip and work in small groups, presentations and discussion.”* *“Excellent selection of content and approach to work- encouraging ambiance and good organization.”* *“I was exceptionally satisfied both in terms of content and structure of the seminar.”* *“Very good choice of places: the First and Second World War, different kind of exhibitions and memory politics, and enough time to discuss among participants. And very well-organized.”*

Satisfaction with the program was also due to the fact that it allowed deep insights in the topic of dealing with the past in France and in general and in the same time stimulating exchanges and development of contacts. *“I am really satisfied with this week. The program was instructive and the exchange within the group was very productive.”* *“Again, a very enriching and enlightening experience with: new historical information/knowledge, information on how often other people work on the same subject; lively discussions; new, interesting contacts for work.”* *“Great input from various angles, however, the discussion in the breaks were as important as the sessions since one learns about other projects, sites, organizations, and their every day challenges.”* *“It was great to meet so many people who deal with similar issues and those who have similar, strong commitment to educate future generations in the Western Balkans. Every conversation showed how much we can learn from each other as a continuous search to future cooperation.”* We will go deeper on this point and give more specific examples in the next part of this report.

Critique was expressed by six persons in relation with the time management of the program, expressing in their evaluation sheets that the program had been *“too full”* and wishing *“more free time”*. *“The study trip was very intense. For Western Balkans people, visiting sites of mass killings is like revisiting their own recent history. Some recuperation time should have been planned in order for people to be able to get back to their senses.”* Some persons mentioned also that the last parts of the visits of Oradour and of the Memorial de la Shoah had been too long.

The most controversial point regarding the content were the remarks of Georges Bensoussan concerning Srebrenica. *“Scandalous and disgraceful”* said some participants, while others pointed out that his remarks had the merit to provoke very interesting and necessary discussions. We will come back to this point below in 5.2.2.

5.2. Results

5.2.1. Learning about memory cultures in France

One main result of the study trip and the workshop concerns what has been discovered and learned about memory cultures in France. *“I learned a lot on French memory culture and got many new information on memorialisation processes outside of Germany and the Balkans.”* This includes also the discovery of the complexity and the sensitivity of memory-issues in France: *“I learned that there are still many painful and sensitive topics from the past regardless of the time distance”*. *“I learned a lot about socio-political context – I was not aware of complexity of the situation in non-Balkan countries.”*

This discovery and learning process was especially linked to the visits of concrete memory sites and the history which is attached to these sites: the Historial of the Great war in Péronne and the monuments on the former battlefields of the Somme, related to the history of the First World War ; the Memorial de la Shoah in Paris and Drancy and the history of the persecution of Jews in France ; the village of Oradour-sur-Glane, and the atrocities against civilians in occupied France – and for all of these sites, the visits raised the awareness about concrete challenges that this difficult history raised and continues to raise in the framework of public remembrance in France.

Concerning the discovery of new topics, the First World War must be especially mentioned. While most of the participants have been dealing or are dealing also with the history of the Second World War and its memory cultures, this has not been the case for the First World War, which for many, before this seminar, had been the topic far away from their field of interest. *“I did not know much about the battle at Somme. Everything we saw, heard*

and visited impressed me.” “The visit of the Historial and the battlefields illustrated very well the importance of WW1 in the European History and also how the WW1 can be an excellent starting point to talk about other wars and about war in general.” Another quotation shows how much the visit of Péronne was an incentive for a more general reflection about wars and violence: “I learned a lot, mainly about difficulties related to finding a way to demilitarize narratives about war, but also society in general and to understand war as a moment of weakness of human kind when evil comes into force, and not as a necessity. It is difficult to talk about war, and the entire workshop program and this presentation put this problem under the light together with the issue of understanding of war and violence of the First World War.”

5.2.2. Learning about dealing with the past more in general

The learning effects concerned not only historical periods and memory cultures related to France, but also dealing-with-the-past processes more in general and the question what should be in the focus of memorialization processes. Concerning the first item, one participant for example listed what he had become aware about through this week: *“The importance of state politics in dealing with the past, and possible problems that can be triggered by existence of certain politics. Dealing with the past is a process consisting of different phases and includes different groups and institutions. Relevance of memorial centers in the process of dealing with the past, significance of history as a science, and respect to sufferings of an individual”*. Others wrote: *“I learned that no state voluntarily remembers difficult pasts and that without pressure from victims' organizations and other NGOs things don't move easily.” “The more we deal with things, the more they become complicated. Dealing with the past, especially the one involving wars and suffering means in fact dealing with the future events. That's what history is teaching us, especially European history. »* Concerning the second item, and especially the pedagogical approach of memory questions, one other participant wrote that he had learned how important it is to emphasize *“explanations/presentations of the overall context (e.g. from 1933), a not only focus on a specific event.”*

Concerning the sensitivity of certain historical topics and the challenge how to talk about them in an appropriate way, remarks of Georges Bensoussan related to Srebrenica and the definition of genocide, as well as the reactions they provoked, were a strong incentive to discuss about these topics and an important awareness-raising moment. *“The lecture by the historian in the Shoah memorial revealed the complexity of dealing with these issues. It showed the different dimensions and levels we all communicate, from personal, historical, psychological, legal point of view, and how difficult it is to find a way to talk about such a sensitive and complicated topics as genocide. The historian's speech was inaccurate and one-sided, but was also a way to start discussing these topics.” “The reactions after the remark of Georges Bensoussan on Srebrenica, and the discussions about the remark and the reactions, illustrated how sensitive the topics we are dealing with are, and how important it is to talk about existing problems and not to avoid them.”* Some persons emphasized the importance for a productive discussion *“to know legal and scientific definitions and different perspectives”*, while others underlined the danger of political manipulation of the term genocide and also the danger *“to have a stiff general definition of genocide”*: *“As all socio-political phenomena, genocide is also evolving, and we should take this into consideration when we talk about it.” “If you are not part of the victim group, such definitions may seem*

not so shocking. But this calls into question the sense of classifying crimes. How do we define criteria and even when they are defined, are they engraved in stone ?””The legal categorisation of crimes by Memorial de la Shoah: *I understood what kind of human reaction it can cause if one is speaking strictly using scientific speech, not involving emotions.*” Is it enough to have a “cold”, scientific approach to mass murder and definition of genocide, without combining it with empathy, especially in face of persons who are themselves survivors? Georges Bensoussans remarks on Srebrenica showed also that many scholars in Western Europe are not really familiar with and interested in the Western Balkans, and constituted one illustration of the important psychological gap which exists between Western Europe and the Western Balkans also in the field of dealing with the past.

5.2.3. Stimulating questions and learning about own attitudes

Different participants noticed also in their evaluation sheets that this week provoked self-critical learning effects about themselves and their own attitudes concerning dealing with the past issues: *“I found out that I lacked information about some things, and at the same time sometimes I tend to take things for granted.” “I need to review some personal views on past and present; professional turn towards educational sector requires much more information, knowledge and experience in order to be successful.” “I need to devote my time to fact searching process away from a specific event, but to focus on causes.” “I should try to push certain topics more at home.” “I learned how biased I am.” „I realized once more, that I have a very German perspective on many things, despite the fact that I am always working in transnational configurations. The perception from outside on your own way of perception is very helpful fort he own cognitive faculty. It is very important to listen carefully, to take time, to ask questions, to review your own questions.“*

Other quotations also show that the week stimulated questions and awareness about the own approaches of dealing with the past, as well as the curiosity to know more: *“The most important for me was the testimony of Robert Hebras and the impact it had on me: How can you forgive? Could I forgive such atrocity?” “I realized that the appeal “Never forget!” actually means “Know!” and not “Remember!”. I cannot remember what my grandfather who was in the Wehrmacht did, he took his memory to his grave. But I can strive to know.” “Each time I figure out how much more I need to learn, and the same time I feel happy for the fact that each time I upgrade my knowledge !”*

5.2.4. Mutual incentives between the Western Balkans and Western Europe

Many participants from the Western Balkans wrote that the French experiences were a stimulating incentive to think about memory cultures in their own countries: *“The visits to the sites were particularly useful and relevant to me, along with notion on approaches to memorialisation in France, which helped me to think about memorialisation in the Balkans from new positions and perspectives.”* The Historial of the Great War seems to have been particularly stimulating for participants from the Western Balkans, first through its multiperspective approach: *“The Peronne museum represents particularly interesting and specific institution because of it multi-perspective approach, and therefore it deserves special attention as a possible model of museum approach. At the same time it raises an issue whether it takes a hundred years time distance to approach the sensitive topics in this way.” “Institutions are trying to perceive events they commemorate from several different perspectives; a process is complicated but it gives results, which gives hope that it can be successful in other places too e.g. in the Balkans.”* And also de-glorification of the war and the cultural approach of the Historial were seen as a useful incentive for the countries of the former Yugoslavia: *“The Historial was impressive.(...) I especially liked the de-glorification*

of the war. I think that is a very useful model to be applied (if EVER possible) in the Western Balkans.” “The focus is not on magnitude of the crime and number of victims, which I find being an interesting example to the former Yugoslavian countries where number of victims is usually in focus, and which is frequently used for manipulations of different kind.” Also the other visited sites stimulated the reflection about the situation in the Balkans, for example Drancy: *“A very interesting overlapping of every day life and memory place. This concept can be very useful experience for BiH attempts to mark places of suffering that today have totally different function.”*

Other remarks also illustrate the positive impact that the discovery of places outside of the Balkans has for persons coming from there. One participant for example stretches *“how important it is, for us from the Balkans, not to observe the dealing with the past process as our exclusive, unique and most complex problem. Other European countries deal with this process even today (still).”* Another person wrote: *“It was interesting to find out that we in the Balkans share the same or similar difficulties with countries of Western Europe; but at the same time observing inevitable differences.”*

Even if the seminar this year took place in France and the main focus was on this country, the learning process was not one-sided - through the common discussions the participants from Western Europe received also incentives from the Western Balkans, as appears in the following quotation: *“At the Memorial de la Shoah, Anisa explained that genocide studies concepts had been actively used in the planing of the 90s violence in the Balkans. I realized that this distortion of a work requires a self reflexion. People from the Balkans probably have more to teach us than the other way around.”*

5.2.5. Useful incentives for the own work

Several participants noted that this week had not only been useful as a general incentive for the reflection about the situation in their own country, but that they could use what they had seen, heard and explored very concretely in their work: *“I have never known that France had such serious issues in dealing with its own past in regards to its responsibility about WWII (as well as WWI). This I learned at this trip and now I can draw some parallels between several European countries in regards to their approaches to DwP and that is super useful for my work.”* *“For me personally, the visit to Oradur was a highlight of the seminar, as it gave me a perspective on how memorials could be structured, with incorporated testimonies of people who witnessed an event. I find testimonies extremely relevant.”* *“I will be able to use for my work: Some methods of presentation from Peronne (debasement of soldiers- placing them on lower levels, and modified presentation of trenches), presentation of wider context in which the event took place (all the three visited institutions) ; some of pedagogic methods applied in work with school children (dialogue with witness of Oradour event, linking distant past with modern life – Peronne , and story about hope and life in spite of horrible tragedy – Shoah Memorial).”* *“It was interesting to see how the British commemorate because commemoration is a subject on which we work. We plan to present photographs with the names to individualize each person commemorated. These persons are not just numbers. The visit of the Somme battlefields helped me to think further about the concepts of memorialisation, the question of space and of the materials used to remember the missing of Prijedor.”* *“For me the most interesting was the concept of a joint commemoration that I had the opportunity to see in Peronne. Given that my organization works with veteran groups I am aware that in Bosnia commemoration are usually organized by ethnic lines. In Peronne I've seen how it is possible to organize a joint commemoration of*

those who fought on opposite sides in the war.” “In the context of the “Visit of the Old Fairground”-project [in Belgrade] for me the visit of Drancy was very important. The manner in which they re-established life in former concentration camp and how they are dealing with the difficult past of this place can be very important future discussion about Old Fairgrounds which will certainly happen in Serbia in the time being.” Not only the visited sites were seen as incentives for the own work, but also the exchange with the other members of the group ; one participant for example stretched that what would be useful for his own work were the “*new methods used by other organizations*”, and another wrote: “*I have written down many approaches and methods that are being used in the organizations that work with youngsters. Next to that I received feedback on my own project, which was very useful. Last, but definitely not the least, I have established many possible contacts for future cooperation.*”

5.2.6. Networking / developing and deepening of contacts

As appears already in the last quotation, many participants also stress the establishment and developing of contacts as an important result of this week. “*This week helps to create most productive contacts for pedagogical and scientific work.*” “*Some contacts that I have established are very valuable.*” The exchange between the participants was seen as very productive and one person for example characterized the group as a “*very inspiring group of participants that widens the scope additionally to everything we see and hear.*” As positive factor is seen the fact that there is an important personal continuity concerning the participants since the first workshop of the platform in 2010 and that in the same time new persons are joining the platform. The integration of the new participants occurred very easily. And the fact that many know each other from the former workshops contributes to positive results: “*A real added value is seeing people again and developing friendly ties that encourage to dig the subject even more.*” At the same time, the week spent together gives the participants also a better content-base for future cooperation: “*In case of future cooperation with organisations of the Western Balkans and France I have much more understanding of how they work and what issues and methods are important for them.*”

Several persons furthermore emphasized as a positive result the planning of concrete activities and the development of follow-up-perspectives after this meeting, and underlined their own will to contribute actively: “*The working group was very useful, I made many new contacts and am committed to stay on board.*” “*I like the very participative approach, this is an interesting platform to which I would like to stay closely connected.*” “*I like the idea to have soon a strategy-meeting with a part of the group, as during the seminar itself we don’t have really the time to go too deep into the reflection about the further development of the platform.*”

5.2.7. Continuity

Some of the persons which have already participated in 2010 and/or 2011 underline the continuity of the approach in the study trip and workshop as a positive factor. However, some persons also mentioned that they have seen improvements this year: “*This year there was more time for the reflection on what we had seen, I think this was very helpful. I have the impression that I have learned new things but in the same time also that I have heard the perspectives of the other participants on what we have seen. This is extremely enriching for*

me personally as well as for my work. For the program next year I would chose the same structure.“

6. Future perspectives

During the workshop, it has already been announced that the studytrip and workshop 2013 are planned to take place next fall in Berlin-Brandenburg and at the Polish-German border.

Concerning the organisation of the workshop and study trip in 2013 and furthermore, the following suggestions have been articulated in the evaluations at the end of the workshop in Limoges:

- Four suggestions concern the time-management, wishing to make the program less dense: *“one more free evening”*; *“zeitlich entzerrt”* ; *“Please, give people the chance to recuperate. This can be very stressful. Bear in mind that some people in the group are/will be survivors of some terrible wars”*; *“Try to make program less intensive, although I think it is almost impossible, as it would be pity to exclude anything from this study visit for example”*
- Also four suggestions concerning the content of the program next year in Berlin-Brandenburg and the Polish-German border: *“It would be interesting to include visits of sites linked to the history of Eastern-Germany and how in Eastern Germany was dealt with history, and also to the Third Reich.”* ; *“As it will be in Berlin (or nearby), talk about “Cold war” and different memories in West/East. Insist on artistic ways to deal with memories.”*, *“Include an art historian in a visit to a monument and “read” the monument under his/her guidance.”* ; *“include a visit in Auschwitz”*
- Three persons suggest to strengthen within the program the part of networking and planning of future projects: *“Work more on networking of participants and new projects. More precisely define workshop topics”*
- Four suggest more time and more interactive approach for the visit of each site: *“Encourage more interaction amongst the group members, more discussions on different methodologies applied in work.”*; *“More space and time should be allowed for reflecting and commenting on what is seen and heard, including the most interesting topics that arise during the visits to memory places. Less presentations by so called experts.”*; *“more time for each visit”* and *“more interactive approach”* in visits ; *“Limit the presentation from officials (directors, mayors, etc) to ten minutes. Longer time for discussions /reflections after visits”*
- Two suggest to insist on educational aspects: *“Detailed presentation of different and specific educational and pedagogic methods and tools”* ; *“Separate education and memorization topics i.e. application of history and memory in human rights and tolerance education”*
- Two suggestion concern the participating persons/ the composition of the group: *“Include as many survivors as possible. / Historians from the Balkans who study same or similar topics”* ; *“Include an organization that is NGO from France and fights for memory issues (e.g. pieds noirs)”*
- Five suggestions concern places and topics for the study trip/workshop 2014 or later: Serbia ; Benelux ; Greece ; one person suggests *“outside Europe but it is probably hard to manage due to organisational and financial aspects”*; *“Maybe to include the WWI and the Balkans Wars in order to broaden a context.”*

During the workshop it was also decided to organize in January 2013 a strategy-meeting of three days, with the members of the organization team plus other interested persons of the platform. The idea to organize this strategy meeting came from a two-fold observation: on one hand, after three years, the platform seems to have found a certain format and rhythm, but nevertheless (or because of this) it seems essential to think more deeply about its further development and many questions still need to be clarified; on the other hand, during the annual study trips and workshops, there is not enough time to talk and go deeper into these more structural questions. The idea to include also other persons from the platform in this meeting illustrates the participative approach of the platform and the will to strengthen it.

The aims of this strategy meeting will be the following:

- To evaluate the first two years of the platform
- To develop a strategy for the further development of the platform
- To work on specific topic/actions linked to the further development (mission statement, website, financing ...)
- To prepare the study visit and workshop in Germany and at the German-Polish border in October 2013

The following persons have declared themselves interested to participate at this meeting: Tamara Banjeglav (*Documenta*, Zagreb), Laura Boerhout (Anne Frank House, Amsterdam), Griet Brosens (Belgian Institute for Warveterans, Brussels), Maja Cecen (Fund B 92, Belgrad), Frederick Hadley (Historial of the Great War, Péronne), Dr. Matthias Heyl (Memorial Centar Ravensbrück), Lejla Mamut (TRIAL, Sarajevo), Alma Masic (YIHR BiH, Sarajevo), Dr. Nicolas Moll (Centre Malraux, Paris/Sarajevo), Frank Morawietz (DFJW, Berlin), Jacqueline Niesser (Institute for Applied History, Frankfurt/Oder), Corinna Noack-Aetopoulos (Centar for Democratisation and Reconciliation South Eastern Europe, Thessaloniki), Melina Sadikovic (ACIPS, Sarajevo), Juliane Tomann (Institute for Applied History, Frankfurt Oder)

The evaluation sheets from 2010, 2011 and 2012 will be an important basis for the working. To complete this, a short questionnaire will be sent in January to the participants, asking them for their perception of strengths and weaknesses of the platform, and their expectations and possible contributions concerning the further development.

Annex 1:

Dealing with difficult pasts in the Western Balkans and Western Europe
– Platform for Trans-European exchange and cooperation
Third international workshop and study trip, France 7-13 October 2012

Program

Study Trip:

Sunday, October 7th:

Study trip participants' arrival in Paris.

Accommodation in Paris:

Hotel Ibis Budget Paris La Villette

57-63, Avenue Jean Jaurès

75019 Paris

Tel : (+33)892680891

<http://www.etaphotel.com/gb/hotel-4982-ibis-budget-paris-la-villette-19eme-ex-etap-hotel/index.shtml>

Optional :

19h-19h30 : Meeting in the hotel lobby, then going for a walk and drink in Montmartre

Monday, October 8th:

Breakfast in the hotel (buffet opens at 6h30)

7h45: Meeting in the lobby of the hotel

8h00: Departure by bus from the hotel

10h00: Arrival in Péronne, **Historial of the Great War**: welcome and general presentation of the Historial, with Hervé François, director of the Historial

10h30: Presentation and visit of the permanent exhibition

11h45: Presentation of the pedagogical activities, with Christophe Thomas, Educational Department of the Historial, and discussion about the multi-perspective approach of the Historial

12h45: Lunch at the restaurant “Aux gars du Nord”

14h00: Departure by bus and visit of the battlefields of the Somme, with Frederick Hadley, second curator of the Historial:

- Memorial for South-African soldiers in Longueval

- Memorial to the Missing of the Somme in Thiepval

17h30: Travel back to Paris by bus

Approx. 19h30: arrival at the hotel in Paris

Evening at free disposal

Tuesday, October 9th:

Breakfast in the hotel (buffet opens at 6h30)

Until 8h45: Check out of the hotel

8h45 : Meeting in the lobby and departure from the hotel, travel by metro to the Shoah Memorial (17 rue Geoffroy-l'Asnier, 75004 Paris)

9h30 : Arrival at the **Shoah Memorial**, welcome of the group

10h00 : Visit to the Shoah Memorial: Wall of Names, crypt, permanent exhibition

11h30 : Presentation of the pedagogical activities of the Memorial, with Jacques-Olivier David, Educational Department.

12h30 : Lunch in the restaurant «Les Mauvais Garçons» (4 rue des Mauvais Graçons)

14h00 : «The Shoah between history and memory»: Conference by Georges Bensoussan, historian, followed by discussion

15h15 : Travel to Drancy by bus

16h00 : Visit to the former internment camp in Drancy, with Alban Perrin, coordinator of the Training Department of the Memorial.

17h15 : Travel back to Paris by bus, pick-up of the luggage at the hotel, continuation of travel to Limoges.

During the day: Arrival in Paris of the participants who didn't take part in the study visit.

Meeting place: Shoah Memorial (17 rue Geoffroy-l'Asnier, 75004 Paris), 15h at the latest.

18h00: Departure by bus from Paris to Limoges

Ca. 23h00: Arrival in Limoges

Accommodation and seminar place in Limoges:

Chéops 87

55 rue de l'Ancienne Ecole Normale d'Instituteurs

87000 Limoges

Tel. : 0033 (0) 5 55 30 08 10

<http://www.cheops87.com/>

Workshop:

Wednesday, October 10th:

Breakfast (from 7h00-8h30)

09h30-10h15 : Welcome and presentation of the program

10h15 -11h00: Feedback about the study trip (part one in plenary)

11h00-11h30 Coffee break

11h30-12h30: Feedback about the study trip (part two in small groups)

12h45-14h30: Lunch break

14h30-15h45 “From consensus to controversy: the public remembrance in France of the First World War, the Second World War and the Algerian War”: General overview by Nicolas Moll, historian, followed by discussion

15h45 – 16h00 Coffee break

16h00-18h30 What is (not) new in our countries? Current challenges in the field of memorialization and dealing with the past in Western Europe and in South Eastern Europe – short presentations, followed by discussion

19h00: Dinner

20h15: Screening of short video clips on the work and current projects of the participating organizations in the field of memorialization and dealing with the past

Thursday, October 11th:

Breakfast (between 7h00-8h30)

8h45 : Departure by bus to Oradour-sur-Glane

9h30 : Arrival at the **Centre de la Mémoire of Oradour-sur-Glane**

9h45 : Presentation and visit of the permanent exhibition of the Centre de la Mémoire

11h : Visit of the **Martyr Village**

12h45-13h45 : Lunch break

13h45 : Surviving Oradour, giving testimony after Oradour: Encounter with Robert Hébras, survivor of the massacre of 1944 in Oradour

15h15 : Constructing the future with and despite the past: Encounter with Raymond Frugier, mayor of Oradour-sur-Glane, and visit to the new village

17h30 : Departure from Oradour, travel back to Chéops in Limoges

19h00: Dinner

Evening at free disposal

Friday, October 12th:

Breakfast (between 7h00 and 8h30)

9h00-9h45: Return on the visit of Oradour: impressions, opinions, questions

9h45-11h15 : «The memory of the massacre of Oradour as a challenge for France and the French-German relations» : Intervention by Pascal Plas, historian, followed by discussion

11h15-11h30: Coffee break

11h30-12h30: How to continue? Planning of the working groups for the afternoon

12h45-14h30: Lunch break

14h30- 16h30 How to continue? Future development of the platform (mission statement, website, edition 2013 in Germany/Poland,...) and of activities and projects (Priedor 2013, World War I anniversary 2014, other projects proposed by the participants...). Discussion in working groups.

16h30-17h00 Coffee break

17h00-18h00: Presentation of the results of the working groups and discussion

18h00-19h00 Evaluation of the program, conclusions and perspectives

20h30: Farewell dinner in the restaurant “Mamy Bigoude” in Limoges

Saturday, October 13th:

Breakfast (from 7h00-7h45)

8h00: Departure from Limoges by bus

Approx. 13h30: Arrival in Paris, train station *Gare du Nord*

The working languages are English and Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian, with simultaneous or consecutive translation. Some presentations will be held in French, with translation into English and BCS.

Annex 2: Participants study trip and workshop, France 2012

| Name | Organization | Function | Country Town |
|----------------------------------|--|--|----------------------------|
| Maša Avramović | Center for development of culture of children's rights | Head of the organisation | Kragujevac (SRB) |
| Kristina Babić | Agency for local democracy Osijek | External associate | Osijek (HR) |
| Tamara Banjeglav* | Documenta - Center for dealing with the past | Project coordinator | Zagreb (HR) |
| Doruntina Basha | forumZFD Kosovo | Project Coordinator | Pristina (KOS) |
| Ervin Blažević | Optimisti 2004 Kozarac | President | Prijedor (BiH) |
| Laura Boerhout | Anne Frank House – International Department | Project coordinator “Memory walk in Sarajevo” | Amsterdam (NL) |
| Stéphanie Boutaud | Oradour Memory Center | Head of the Educational Service | Oradour sur Glane (FR) |
| Griet Brosens | Belgium Nationals Institute for War veterans | Historian, in charge of educational remembrance-projects | Brussels (B) |
| Hvalenka Carrara d'Angely | | Interpreter BCS – French | Paris (F) |
| Marija Čečen | Foundation B92 | Director | Beograd (SRB) |
| Durđa Đukić | YIHR Serbia | Project assistant | Beograd (SRB) |
| Hervé François | Historial of the Great War | Director | Péronne (F) |
| Alain Gueraud | DRJSCS du Limousin | CEPJ | Limoges (F) |
| Frederick Hadley | Historial of the Great War | Second Curator | Péronne (F) |
| Elma Hašimbegović | Historical museum of BiH | Curator | Sarajevo (BiH) |
| Nedžad Horozović | Centar for nonviolent action (CNA) | Member of the team | Sarajevo (BiH) |
| Dr. Axel Klausmeier | Berlin Wall Foundation | Director | Berlin (D) |
| Ana Kršinić - Lozica | Croatian museum of architecture | Research assistant | Zagreb (HR) |
| Joachim König | Memorial of Buchenwald | Pedagogical department | Weimar-Buchenwald (D) |
| Carine Leveque | ONAC National office for war veterans and war victims | Coordinator Memory and communication | Montpellier (F) |
| Alma Mašić* | Youth Initiative for Human Rights BiH | Director | Sarajevo (BiH) |
| Sven Milekić | YIHR Croatia | Coordinator program Transitional Justice | Zagreb (HR) |
| Dragana Milutinović | ForumZFD Kosovo | Project Coordinator | Pristina (KOS) |
| Dr. Nicolas Moll* | Centar André Malraux | Historian and Consultant | Sarajevo (BiH) / Paris (F) |
| Frank Morawietz* | French-German Youth Office (OFAJ) | Special coordinator for the activities of OFAJ in SEE | Berlin (D) |
| Dejan Motl | Memorial Site Donja Gradina | Curator – historian | Demirovac (BiH) |
| Sudbin Musić | Prijedor 92 | Secretary | Prijedor (BiH) |
| Nevena Negojević | Cultural center Rex | <i>Staro Sajmište</i> Project assistant | Beograd (SRB) |

| | | | |
|---------------------------------|--|---|--------------------|
| Jacqueline Nießer | Institute for applied history | Project manager + PhD Student | Berlin (D) |
| Corinna Noack-Aetopoulos | CDRSEE Center for Democracy and Reconciliation in Southeast Europe | Director of Programmes | Thessaloniki (GR) |
| Ivo Pejaković | Memorial Site Jasenovac | Museum curator | Jasenovac (HR) |
| Timon Perabo | Anne Frank Zentrum | Project director “War children – life paths until today” | Berlin (D) |
| Alban Perrin | Mémorial de la Shoah | Coordinator Training Department | Paris (F) |
| Edin Ramulić | Association of citizens of Prijedor «Izvor» | Vice president | Prijedor (BiH) |
| Melina Sadiković | ACIPS | Coordinator SCOPES project “History, Memory and State Building” | Sarajevo (BiH) |
| Günter Schlusche | Berlin Wall Foundation | Architect / Planner | Berlin (D) |
| Dinko Sijerčić* | Youth Initiative for Human Rights BiH | Program coordinator | Sarajevo (BiH) |
| Anisa Sućeska Vekić | Balkan Investigative Reporting Network BIRN | Director | Sarajevo (BiH) |
| Ulvija Tanović | | Interpreter BCS – English | Sarajevo (BiH) |
| Juliane Tomann | Institute for applied history | Project manager + PhD Student | Frankfurt Oder (D) |

* Members of the organisation team

Annex 3: General information on the organizers / grant applicants

Youth Initiative for Human Rights BiH, Sarajevo

Objectives and activities: Advancing the participation of youth in democratisation of society, strengthening rule of law in processes of facing the past and creating new progressive links in the post-war region of Ex-Yugoslav countries. YIHR BH builds new links amongst young people within BiH, especially in terms of inclusion of divided communities and encouragement of Europeanization of the Western Balkans through regional cooperation of young people from different countries of the former Yugoslavia. Through trainings, study visits, workshops, conferences, street actions and development of educational material, YIHR BiH supports and encourages young people of BiH to promote social and political action related to issues relevant to young people. Such promotion includes advancement of the 1992-1995 BiH war remembrance culture, advocating for human rights protection, minority rights, and promotion of issues related to EU integration processes and democratisation of the Western Balkans region. In the field of dealing with the past, activities in the last two years have for example been the “Srebrenica – Mapping Genocide”-project, summer camps for young activists from the region in Kozarac, debates and screenings of the movie “Belvedere”. – The office of the **YIHR Kosovo** was also involved in the preparation of the study trip and workshop in France in October 2012, especially regarding the participants from Kosovo.

The **French-German Youth Office (FGYO)**, besides its experience in activities promoting intercultural learning and cooperation, is especially since the 1990s organizing and supporting activities in the field of memory work, not only between France and Germany, but also with third countries. Since 2000, in the framework of its South Eastern Europe Initiative, supported by the Ministries for Foreign Affairs of France and Germany, it contributes to create links between civil society actors from France and Germany and the Western Balkans, including a specific work on memory sites and reconciliation linked with French-German experiences since 1945.

Documenta – Center for Dealing with the Past aims to develop social and individual processes of dealing with the past in order to build sustainable peace in Croatia and wider region through deepening of public dialogue and initiating debate on public policies which stimulate dealing with the past, gathering and publishing documentation and research of war incidents and their assumptions, war crimes and violations of human rights as well as monitoring judicial processes at a local and regional level. Since 2006 *Documenta* works on building and strengthening regional civil society coalition representing key stakeholders from post-Yugoslav countries in order to sensitize the public and national governments on the need for justice for victims and need for regional post-conflict fact-finding and truth-telling. In 2010, *Documenta* has organized a series educational study trips to sites of memory related to the 1941-1945 period in Croatia and will continue to organize in 2011 and 2012 regional study visits in Bosnia, Serbia and Croatia to places of remembrance related to WWII.

For the **Centre Malraux Sarajevo**, created as French NGO in Sarajevo in 1994/5 as a concrete sign of European solidarity with the inhabitants of the besieged city, memory work is an integral part of its cultural activities aiming to create links between Bosnia and Herzegovina and the rest of Europe. The Centre Malraux has for example organized, together with the FGYO, in 2008/9 a French-German-Bosnian project for students of the three countries on “difficult memory sites in Europe”, and in 2009 and 2010 a photograph exhibition about the war in Bosnia which was shown in Sarajevo, Paris and Oradour.

Annex 4: Contact Coordination team

Tamara Banjeglav

Project coordinator

Documenta – Centar za suočavanje s prošlošću / Center for dealing with the past

Kuća ljudskih prava, Selska cesta 112c, HR-10000 Zagreb

Tel.: +385 1 457 2398, Mob : + 38598685747

e-mail: tamara.banjeglav@documenta.hr

www.documenta.hr

Alma Mašić (logistics and finances SEE)

Director

The Youth Initiative for Human Rights in BiH (YIHR)

Mula Mustafe Bašeskije 8 / 4, BiH – 71000 Sarajevo

Tel.: +387 33 219 047, Mob : +38762336675

alma@yih.org

<http://ba.yih.org>

Dr. Nicolas Moll (general coordination)

Historian and Consultant

Centre André Malraux

Mula Mustafe Baseskije 8, BiH - 71000 Sarajevo

Mob BiH: +38762927407, Mob France : +33647557573

nicolasmoll@malraux.ba

www.malraux.ba

Frank Morawietz

Special coordinator for the activities of OFAJ in South-Eastern Europe

French-German Youth Office (DFJW/OFAJ)

Molkenmarkt 1, D - 10115 Berlin

Mob. : +49173-6948793

frankmorawietz@web.de

www.ofaj.org / www.dfjw.org

Dinko Sijerčić (logistics and finances SEE)

The Youth Initiative for Human Rights in BiH (YIHR)

Mula Mustafe Bašeskije 8 / 4, BiH – 71000 Sarajevo

Tel.: +387 33 219 047; Mob : +38761141887

dinko@yih.org

<http://ba.yih.org>

Annex 5: Working Groups 12.10.2012 - Summaries:

➔ Dialogue between generations / Project idea “17 – 17 – 17”

Developed by Anisa Sućeska Vekić, Laura Boerhout, Kristina Babić, Maša Avramović, Timon Perabo

We organize in Bosnia talks in small groups between people of three generations: the generation that was seventeen during the Second World War, the generation that was seventeen during the Bosnian War and the generation that is seventeen today. Through these talks new perspectives can be created for all three participating generations on wars, how they evolve, how they can be prevented and what people contribute on individual basis for war and peace. And it can help to understand how necessary it is to deal with a difficult past in order to prevent wars in the next generation.

Parts of these talks are recorded on film and can be presented as documentary to others who were not able to participate in the talks directly. Schools would be one target group for this film.

Open questions/further ideas:

- Should different ethnic groups talk with each other in this project?
- Should the perspectives of other countries (on Second World War) be involved?
- Questions in the talk could be: What were you dreaming of after the war? How did you deal with trauma/sorrow? What needs to be done for reconciliation? What is the best antiwar method?
- History approach is more attractive for young people than human rights approach
- It should be about the daily life of ordinary people – not about famous people
- One approach could be to show patterns of discrimination that lead to war and compare it with discrimination today
- The talks about history should not be on the level of big politics but on the level of personal experiences. This allows multiperspectivity.

BIRN Bosnia and the Anne Frank Zentrum Berlin want to develop this idea further during a visit of Anisa in Berlin in spring 2013. This could be a base for cooperation between BIRN and Anne Frank Zentrum in this project. Until then the Anne Frank Zentrum will gather additional experiences from the project »Warchildren – lifepaths until today« that creates dialogue between two generations in Eastern Germany.

The Anne Frank Zentrum and BIRN will keep the other organizations informed, that were part of developing this idea, and involve them wherever they are interested.

Minutes: Timon Perabo

➔ Nove tehnologije i memorijalizacija

U radu grupe učestvovali su: Đurđa Đukić, Doruntina Bashe, Ervin Blažević
Zaključci:

Nove tehnologije koje se koriste i mogu da se koriste u oblasti memorijalizacije ne isključuju „klasične“ obilike memorijalizacije (kao što su npr. spomenici, muzeji itd.) već treba da služe

kao njihova dopuna ili zamena u slučajevima kada nije moguće izgraditi neku vrstu fizičkog memorijala.

Neke od prednosti korišćenja novih tehnologija u ovoj oblasti su:

- Interaktivnost, mogućnost „demokratizacije memorijalizacije“ – velika mogućnost razmene iskustava i komentarisanja
- Veća dostupnost u vremenu i prostoru – većini stvari se može pristupiti 00-24h, mobilnost i mogućnost prisupa sa bilo kog mesta
- Upotrebom novih tehnologija može se doći do većeg auditorijuma
- Prijemčivije za nove generacije, može se koristiti kao sredstvo za edukaciju
- Mogućnost za uspostavljanje platforme za zajednički dijalog pogotovo u podeljenim društvima
- Može da posluži kao zamena tamo gde je nemoguće upostaviti fizički memorijal zbog npr. politički, administrativnih i dr. prepreka
- Internet je slobodni mediji te umanjuje uticaj politike i mogućnost cenzure pogotovo u osetljivim oblastima kao što je memorijalizacija
- Brojne tehničke prednosti: mogućnost prikazivanja većeg broja podataka, lakša obrada i prikupljanje podataka, mogućnost lakše korekcije i evaluacije
- Veća mogućnost prilagođavanja ciljnoj grupi, korisnici imaju mogućnost kreiranja sopstvene agende shodno interesovanjima
- Jeftinije
- Multimedijalnost
- Lakša distribucija informacija
- Kroz virtuelno može da se utiče na realno

Neke od mana korišćenja novih tehnologija u oblasti memorijalizacije

- Nije prijemčivo za starije generacije
- Poteškoće pri čuvanju i zaštiti informacija
- Pitanje pouzdanosti i proverljivosti informacija
- Stvara se distanca odsustvom fizičkog kontakta, tako da je potrebno zadržati i dodir sa materijalnim kada je to moguće

Minutes: Djurdja Djukic

➔ Prijedor

1. Uspostaviti koordinacijsku ekspertnu grupu (KEG) 5-7 članova
 - Do februara 2013.godine grupa konstituisana, usvojen plan rada i određeni ciljevi
 - Identifikovana dodatna grupa eksperata
2. Sastanci u Prijedoru – februar i mart 2013.
 - Sa predstavnicima udruženja žrtava i drugih NVO
 - Sa predstavnicima lokalne vlasti
 - Sa nastavnicima istorije, kustosima muzeja i drugim

3. Formirati proširenu radnu grupu od lokalnih predstavnika koji su identifikovani na sastancima
4. Javne tribine u lokalnim zajednicama (multietnička naselja – Trnopolje, Ljubija...) – mart 2013.
5. Konferencija o memorijskim spomenicima u Prijedoru – maj-juni
 - Nastupi u lokalnim medijima – edukacija ljudi i informisanje o aktivnostima KEG

Mogući ciljevi:

1. Edukacija stanovništva o memorijskim spomenicima
2. Izgradnja memorijskih spomenika svim žrtvama (ili rješavanje pitanja spornih memorijskih spomenika)
3. Podrška nekoj od postojećih inicijativa za uspostavu memorijskih spomenika u Prijedoru
4. Izvještaj o memorijskim spomenicima u Prijedoru sa preporukama (izvještaj o problemima ili izvještaj o napretku)

Dio logistike za aktivnosti obezbjedilo bi Udruženje Prijedorčanki "Izvor"

- Organizovanje javnih tribina uz smještaj i troškove boravka članova KEG-a
- Organizovanje konferencije (osim troškova putovanja iz inostranstva)
- Zakup medijskog prostora

Dodatno bi "Izvor" pripremio pregled sadašnjeg stanja po pitanju memorijske spomenikizacije u Prijedoru sa fotografijama spomen obilježja i osnovnim informacijama

Minutes : Edin Ramulic

➔ **Memorialization / transformation**

U rad ove grupe su bili uključeni Nevena Negojevic, Laura Boerhout, Ivo Pejakovic, Sudbin Music, Dragana Milutinovic, Nedžad Horozovic, Ana Krsinic - Lozica, Dejan Motl i Melina Sadikovic

Svi članovi i članice grupe su svojim radnim i/ili istraživačkim iskustvima, kao i svojim razmišljanjima o procesima transformacije i memorijske spomenikizacije doprinjeli zanimljivoj i sadržajnoj diskusiji. Složili smo se da je za sve zemlje iz regiona specifično slično kulturno nasljeđe, kao i procesi transformacije koji uključuju sljedeće: podizanje spomenika, negiranje (određenih) spomenika i rušenje spomenika, odnosno, raskid sa prethodnim sistemom kroz:

- Reinterpretaciju
- Fizičko mijenjanje
- Mijenjanje narativa

Jedno od razmišljanja sa kojim su se svi prisutni složili jeste da problem nije u mijenjanju spomenika, već činjenica da se tu, u većini slučajeva radi o zloupotrebama spomenika i da često korišteni narativi instrumentaliziraju ideologije koje generišu nasilje. Posmatrajući spomenike i komemorativne prakse kao fenomene u domenu političkog, neka od glavnih pitanja u našoj grupi su bila: kako izgraditi 'idealni spomenik'? šta sve treba uzeti u obzir? i kako odgovoriti na izazove transformacije?

Grupa je okupila veliki broj ljudi koji su svojim razmišljanjima razvili vrlo zanimljivu , informativnu i produktivnu diskusiju. Obzirom na veličinu grupe i motiviranost svih njenih članova da aktivno učestvuju u diskusiji, pokazalo se da je vrijeme određeno za rad bilo nedovoljno .

Ipak, u zadatom vremenskom okviru svi su se složili da je upravo rasprava kakvu smo vodili iznimno važna u pitanjima koja se tiču mjesta sjećanja i komemorativnih praksi u zajednici, odnosno društvu.

Jedan od zaključaka je, da je u slučajevima spomenika koji su svakako podložni transformacijama kroz vrijeme uslijed različitih uticaja, vrlo važno imati multidisciplinarni pristup koji bi uključivao sve prethodne interpretacije tog mjesta/događaja, ali ne s namjerom da se kaže konačna istina, jer je to nemoguće, već da se stvori potencijal za kritičko mišljenje.

Minutes : Melina Sadikovic

➔ Annual Meeting 2013

Participants: Alma Masic, Juliane Tomann, Marija Cecen, Nicolas Moll, Jacqueline Niesser

1. Format

- To be kept: 2 days study visits, 3 days workshops with presentations and field explorations
- October 2013 / Berlin-Brandenburg and German-Polish border
- Invite participants from Macedonia, maybe Montenegro as well

2. Possible topics

- Dealing with GDR history, Stasi, division and reunification of Germany
- Remembrance and past politics (esp. denazification) from a comparative perspective: how did it function in BRD and how in GDR? With which effects?
- Cold war and remembrance (Schwarzbuch etc.)
- Change of memory culture after 1989 (maybe exemplary through presentation the changes in Sachsenhausen or Ravensbrück)
- Globalization of Holocaust memory
- German-Polish relations and the issue of dealing with the history of expulsions
- Remembering minorities' suffering, like Roma and Sinti (maybe talk with Roma representative)
- Educational approaches, esp. how are memorial centres linked with schools and which methods are they applying
- Artistic approaches to memory (also „new“ technologies, comic, film)

3. Funding

- Every organization of the steering team approaches prospective funders in their countries first
- This shall be done before the end of the year with a draft program, so that we know where and how to apply for what when we meet beginning of the year

Minutes: Jacqueline Niesser

→ 2014 / Centennial First World War

Participants: Kristina Babic, Griet Brosens, Hervé François, Alain Gueraud, Frederick Hadley, Elma Hasimbegovic, Axel Klausmeier, Joachim König, Sven Milekic, Corinna Noack-Aetopoulos, Dinko Sijercic

Assessment

- Memorials are lacking a message on how we can prevent violent conflicts.
The participants agree that we can and should explain what patterns lead to war, how violence functions and how to attempt to reduce it over time.
- Asset: comparing. The group has the advantage of being able to work on and compare 1914, 1944 and 1994. Giving elements of explanation on mass violence must be central to the group's work and must aim at suggesting tools to alternatives to escalation towards violent conflicts.
The group is aware that this cannot be done in a few days' program and that it must be part of a broader process. An aim must be to raise awareness that democracy and human rights are always potentially challenged by individuals or groups. Changing behaviors is always difficult because it may be felt by others as simple moralizing.
- The group aims at an applied history. One aim is to find the potential that people can use today for living better.
Never again is an often empty phrase but the aim is to give comparative elements as to what can be done to prevent violence. To analyze the mechanisms of violence in all 3 wars, it will be possible compare material in different museums or sites of violence and see what can be used.
The group cannot change school curriculums but it can change teachers' perspectives. The teacher is the one who enters the class. This could be done by a comparative work with teachers from several countries that would then be used with one's colleagues.

Two-pronged approach

- What content? We need to look at the mechanisms of violence, the way it functions and how it can deescalate.
 - What publics? Teachers, students (especially those wanting to become teachers), youth
- ⇒ Main theme: What pedagogical approach for sites of violence?
- Date: a good option would be 28 June 1914 because, in Sarajevo, the date will not be over-exploited. But schools will not be on vacation. Students training to become teachers might be an option and French Regional Pedagogical Inspectors (IPR) could be convinced to indicate some teachers who could participate.
 - Not just a top-down approach: The life of everyday people (and not only of the great leaders) should be the focus through examples of « best practices », of guidelines, patterns and alternatives to work towards a sustainable peace. For example, transitional justice offers all the steps to explain such a process.

Projects suggestions

- The main suggestion is to take a group of teachers and students to memory sites and museums. This study trip could be done in cooperation with CDSEE, EUROCLIO History educators association on the European level.
The aim is to transmit pedagogical approaches helping the transmission of difficult pasts and of ways to find non-violent resolutions to conflicts. There is a real need and

demand on behalf of teachers for this. This will enable to discuss the pedagogical tasks of memorial sites and schools as whole so as to pursue the work after the visit: knowing the past must encourage civic work afterwards if both types of institutions want to have more impact.

- As a spin-off, Workshops for pupils on the national/local level could also be set up. Usual pedagogical activities at the museums could see their scope broadened: instead of dealing only with WW1, for example, museums would expand to the World War 2 and the Balkan wars in the 90's thanks to the material provided by colleagues from other partner museums.
 - An example of past best practice : mapping genocide was used in the curriculum of the Swedish program
 - Art and history: a photographer could compare pictures of youth today with those of the past. This could link with projects encouraging kids to research a Belgian soldiers and to find his/her story (tombstone, picture, simple biography...). The aim is to make realize that it could happen to any of us. This could be done in several different countries with a common database. Past experience proves it works with kids but with adults too.
 - A traveling exhibition which could be set easily up in three museums and would then travel to other sites.
 - 1914-1989 (as starting points) creations of Europe. Students and pupils directly. A book by Geert Mak "In Europe" about what is the idea of Europe in 20th century and today, starts a little bit earlier but discusses the Somme, World War 2 and Sarajevo.
 - Other activities: cooperation with NGO activists (violence prevention, peace activists, human rights, transitional justice, etc), individual artists and art groups on developing programs and activities; to open museums for different activities
- ⇒ Need to continue exchanges.
- ⇒ Need to find a working title. Possible options: "Never again?", "From Sarajevo to Sarajevo". "Creating Europe" "1914, 1944, 1994", "1918, 1945, 1995", "Violence and its consequences in the pedagogy in museums and sites of violence."

Financing

Projects could come under the "Europe for citizens" program or "Comenius".

http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/citizenship/index_en.php

http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/citizenship/funding/2012/index_en.php

<http://www.europe-education-formation.fr/comenius.php>

Minutes: Frederick Hadley