



Memory Lab
Trans-European Exchange Platform on History and Remembrance

EVALUATIONS

7th annual study trip and workshop
“Told, untold and retold histories”
Serbia, October 9 – 15, 2016

Organized by:
Youth Initiative for Human Rights BiH (Sarajevo),
C31 – Center for Developing Children’s Rights Culture (Belgrade),
Peace Academy Foundation (Sarajevo), Franco-German Youth Office (Paris/Berlin),
Forum ZFD (Pristina / Belgrade / Sarajevo / Skopje)
and crossborder factory (Berlin / Paris / Sarajevo)

In cooperation with and with the support of:
Robert Bosch Foundation, CCFD-Terre Solidaire,
French-German Youth Office, Forum ZFD, Südosteuropa-Gesellschaft



Robert Bosch **Stiftung**





7th international workshop and study trip, 9-15 October 2016: Serbia

Evaluation sheets: Answers of the participants

- 1. Your general opinion about this study trip/workshop.....2**
- 2. Please chose two moments/ places/ encounters/ sentences... from this week which will probably stay in your memory, and explain why.....7**
- 3. Concerning the topic “Told, untold, retold histories”, to what extent did this week provide you with new insights / knowledge / questions?13**
- 4. Suggestions for the future (concerning the annual workshop/study trip and/or Memory Lab in general).....17**

Note: The answers 1 – 21 haven been written in English, the answers 22 to 37 have been translated from Bosnian / Croatian / Serbian.

Question 1. Your general opinion about this study trip/workshop

- 1. I very much enjoyed the study trip. Excellent program and organization. Also, a fantastic group of people with whom I felt like in one group. - Perhaps it would have been possible to have all three walks – Belgrade offers tremendous opportunities to engage with WW2, socialism and 1990s, and it would have been better perhaps to have the opportunity to take all three walks in Belgrade and shorten/ make parallel trips in Novi Sad and Kragujevac (the weapon museum for instance in parallel with something else).
- 2. Excellent program and balanced content concerning the different historical phases of contemporary Serbia. In some point the program could seem a bit dense but it is understandable that there are many places to visit and topics to address.
- 3. The study trip was a great experience, once again. Very diverse places were visited and it gave us the opportunity to have very interesting conversations during the informal moments as well as during the working sessions. Everybody seemed to me very enjoyed and participating deeply. The atmosphere within the group was this year particularly nice. No divided groups. People were mixing from one dinner to the other and I personally had the chance to have long discussions with many different people.

4. This week in Serbia has been really interesting for me. The visits and conferences were nicely chosen but I missed a general overview of the past and current situation in the country which made it difficult for me to follow sometime. It has been also sometimes very emotional for the participants from the area and I felt a bit uncomfortable on a few occasions. I felt that for the first time in Memory Lab meeting, at least so strongly.

5. The group and atmosphere was much more constructive than last year- but do we create sufficient (safe) space and time for controversial discussions?

6. As usually the workshop/ study trip has fulfilled all my expectations. Very well organized and executed, places well picked and group exercises well done. Meeting people and connecting I found again very useful for both myself, but also the Memory Lab as a whole. Although it is organized for the 7th year in a row, it didn't lose its purpose.

7. Good organization (traveling, hotel, food, translation, etc.), everything was very smooth and moved well. I felt comfortable with this the whole time. - I would have wished for one get-to-know-each-other in the big group. Hearing and seeing every name and place would have been helpful. My city walk on the first evening was not good. Nearly no information, not much knowledge about monuments and stuff. The other groups seemed to have had more luck with their guide. - Reflection with 40 people is not my thing... - In general I am very happy, lot of new ideas, contacts, information.

8. + : This edition was (as usual) a success: smooth organization, amazing staff team, enriching and rich program, new encounters, good balance and spread between visits and feedback sessions.
- : A more basic introduction to the history of the country would have been nice, but I learned that it was intended but didn't really work out as planned so.

9. This study trip was generally very well organized to detail. It was intensive and filled with informative and new insights about the history of Serbia in relation to that of other countries. However, I feel that some parts of the trip were too concentrated on the narrative provided by officials connected to state institutions. I wish we could have heard a lot more from alternative/ non-mainstream sources, such as young people, journalists, etc. - My suggestion is to give the group some more time to explore the cities we visit by themselves and walk to random citizens on the streets. That is how you get a better feeling of what is really going on.

10. Well organized mixture of discussions/ exchanges and trips/ visits/ new insights. New members/ participants from Spain/ Romania/ Macedonia are very welcome.

11. Worth taking part in! Interesting participants! It's really good prepared but it could be also useful to provide some overall information about the historical facts and context – I think the organizers tried to do/ prepare this within the first three lectures of the 'historians' but I missed a professional access to this topic e.g. to divide in historical facts – a multiperspective approach (different ways the 'hi/story' is told by different groups/ communities) and personal/ involved views on history. I thought the Lab is more working about 'how to deal/present/teach history' and how history is already used/misused etc.' – actually

most of the time I had the feeling that lot of the people were discussing the past and not how we are dealing with the past. Perhaps this will be easier in Spain... I missed kind of meta-discussion some times.

12. A) For participants not familiar with the (post) Yugoslav context there could have been provided more basic information to be able to follow better the trips/discussions/presentations. B) Some remarks raise tension. My question is how to deal with it. What normally happens is that groups of same minded are built and the core of tension is being discussed in groups. Maybe irritations that are linked with our topic should be integrated in the learning process, instead of being classified as an incident or an excess.

13. These last five days were very interesting. It was very good that these three periods of the past in Serbia were chosen and connected with the concepts of told, untold and retold histories. Memory Lab is a great opportunity to discuss interesting places and meet very interesting people who deal with memory work in different regions. I enjoyed the exchange with other participants and to learn from their experiences.

14. Great group, fantastic new people with different perspectives. Well thought through program, but missing short profiles of participating people (around 40)people - hard and stressful to talk with all of them in 5 days – better to have basic info already on paper as starting point). No mention of Kosovo – Serbian relations – only one participant from Kosovo → should have been discussed

15. Excellent organization, extremely useful paradigm, eye-opening encounters, discussions and visits, great atmosphere within the group. THANK YOU!

16. My general point of view is correct because it's really interesting to try to confront different points of view but it seems, in my opinion, it stay confused at the end because there's no enough history and too much activism. It's also interesting to travel and visit different sites of history and memory but the diversity of the sites is (sometimes) a problem for learning more on this event or another one. To finish, it's really a great experience to connect projects and methods to work in an European perception.

17. Well-structured and carefully made program was characteristic of Memory Lab 7. Refreshing addition were the new participants, who were well selected and it would be good to have some of them in following years. The local organizer, particularly Masa A., did a great job- as an organizer but also as a contributor to the program/ knowledge.

18. The program was rich and well balanced between lectures, visits, workshops and informal conversations. The venue (hotel) is well situated downtown, the rooms comfortable, the meals good and the meeting room (working room) very convenient and nice. Top translator as usual. The choices of visit were done in a proper way which allowed us to reflect on different topics and to compare with what is done in different countries. The organisation team has created an open space within the program, including good mood, warm atmosphere, and mutual respect. New participants from other /different horizons has also created a new warm atmosphere and enriched the inputs.

19. This study trip offered a very interesting program with a variety of topics allowing participants like me to know really more about the history of former Yugoslavia and the way particular aspects of this history were exposed, hidden or transformed in their presentation to new generations. It has been very

important to me to consider the impact of politics, interests, propaganda, emotions and legitimate points of view, on the contemporary description of terrible processes which led to mass massacres, genocide and manipulations of History. I also could better perceive how these told, retold and untold stories are related to a variety of different or divergent feelings, perceptions and statements according to the persons who went through these very sensitive considerations, experiences, cultural and national background. The prospective addressed both historical periods, the Second World War and recent conflicts in the Former Yugoslavia. The study tour has reinforced my thoughts and scientific and educational professional expertise. - The seminar program was very rich and very well organized and accompanied. Opportunities as diverse meetings, site visits, museum and scientific accompaniments have clarified many points of a very complex story in the Balkans. The numerous exchanges between people as different about such complex and sensitive issues were very well supervised and regulated. I consider this seminar was very useful for the acquisition of knowledge, the deepening of my personal and professional reflection, consolidating my professional practice, educational and scientific knowledge and competence in a Memorial site (as Foundation Camp des Milles in Provence) and creating links with great representatives of an effective network. This program will generate actions and partnerships for the Foundation of the Camp des Milles and for the participants of the Platform Memory Lab.

20. I think this study trip/workshop really provided a very good space to get insights and food for thought about current memorialization processes in Serbia, concerning the Second World War, Socialist Yugoslavia and the 1990s, thanks to the choice of the visited places, also because we could hear more official perspectives and also perspective from the civil society. Besides that I think there was a very good group atmosphere and dynamics, and also the fact that the topic of joint activities was tackled from day one helped to have productive working groups the last day.

21. I was very glad to be part of this transnational exchange. The program was very rich and dense. Despite the large number of participants, discussions were generally well moderated and the quality of contributions constructive and high in quality. Logistics seemed demanding but were well taken care of by organizers.

22. Since this was my first time to participate in Memory Lab, I did not know what to expect, but I have to say that I am very pleasantly surprised with the extent of dialogue, analysis, and polemics. This socializing- scientific approach is something that I really may point out as positive.

23. Since it was my first time to participate in Memory Lab, it is difficult to me to compare or provide some in-depth insights and opinions. General impression is that the workshop was very successful in terms of gathering individuals of different, but still very relevant backgrounds, which ensured an excellent exchange and discussion within the group. Moreover, the program concept enabled us to hear and see different perspectives, which I believe is extremely important.

24. Generally speaking, I got what I expected. Not only some new insights and information (and contacts) but also a space for my own reflection in area of memorialisation policy in Serbia. I appreciate informality of the whole initiative, as it avoids "NGO-isation" of the entire concept. What I did not like, or where my expectations were not met, were the group discussions. Frequently we were running around general issues, occasionally it seemed to me there was a lack of understanding of some basic concepts, insufficient level of familiarity with the context on the side of international participants.... Occasionally it

was tiresome, but OK, these were also processes that we learned from. I liked a lot the possibility given at the end to speak about some group, joint work and I believe it will be the most exciting part of the Memory Lab.

25. Complex, inspiring, sometimes frustrating. Good focus, selection of topics, program. Atmosphere within the group was mostly open and supporting.

26. As Tamara wrote on her Facebook-profile: “Memory Lab is a time which combines work and love”, and this annual study trip has in that sense met my expectations, from organisational point of view, to the program and participants.

27. I think it was well organised, well set framework for all five days. Presentations, study tours, workshops, etc. were well balanced. I congratulate you for successful Memory Lab this year.

28. This annual study trip I deem very useful, purposeful, significant and inspiring. I also believe that the study trip involved many significant visits and contents, but unfortunately some of them were not paid duly attention.

29. I am satisfied with an overall concept of the Memory Lab. Dynamics of workshops and presentations enables participants to gain new experiences, insights and provides possibility to visit different places.

30. The program was interesting, layered, inspiring. It would be better if narratives on the Balkan wars in 1912 and 1913, and the WWI were included as Serbia had it specifics. The way it was organised it was narrative about Yugoslavia, i.e. untold narrative about Yugoslavia or re-told narrative about Yugoslavia. There are two main processes in Serbia 1) rebuilding of national state, 2) distancing from communism. Those processes were sufficiently pointed out and visible in this workshop.

31. Well organised (technically), not always enough time for discussions at deeper and more serious level. Interesting selection of interlocutors. Pleasant and high-quality interlocutors in the group. Good informal discussions as well.

32. The study trip/workshop, was well organised, very intensive group and very intensive emotions, and very pleasant atmosphere amongst the participants outside the official part of program.

33. Memory Lab gathers people from different areas, and in that way it ensures that different perspectives are reassessed at all times. Enthusiasm of this group of people for meeting at different locations, learning and creating networks of knowledge in area of memorialisation is inspiring. In addition, Memory Lab is an excellent opportunity for meeting of interesting people and creation of joint projects for the future.

34. The study trip/workshop in Serbia, I am sure, has truly offered a great amount of information on ways of memorialisation of World War Two, socialist heritage in general, i.e. how it is talked about or not talked about the war in nineties from the perspective of NGO sector, but also from the perspective of the government institutions. In my opinion, a direct confrontation of arguments of these two “blocks” was missing; their “fighting” strategy in area of memorialisation policy ; meaning more dialogue and less

“horizontal” presentations – visiting of museums included, which represents my suggestion for the future Memory Lab workshops and answer to question number 4) at the same time

35. Before coming to Memory Lab I did not have any special expectations. The program itself seemed excellent in a context of memorialisation culture of Serbia. However, organisation itself, presentations, different details and presentation of memorialisation culture were excellent. Many new insights, much better told narratives that I already knew, and for me personally the most important questions I found inside of me.

36. The study tour was very well organised, with lot of contents, high quality lecturers and guides.

37. I believe it was interesting and well organised, although my perspective this year was more perspective of organiser than participant. - I liked a new energy in the group, brought by the new people. I believe that the selection of participants was well performed, and that resulted in good exchange, critical thinking, without attacking, judging, etc. In terms of organisations/logistics, I haven't noticed major shortcomings, and I believe that organisation team deserves a great praise for that. In terms of programme, I believe it was good, and that good quality and diverse programme was offered. To me, the weakest point of the programme were introductory presentations, with exceptions of Orli F. who fulfilled expectations. Olga and Jelena's presentations were too general, and it seems to me that we did not get much from them.

Question 2: Please chose two moments/ places/ encounters/ sentences... from this week which will probably stay in your memory, and explain why

1. a) The 1990s-tour in Belgrade, in terms of discussion of personal experiences with events (protests, everyday life, perspectives on the utility/ just character of NATO bombing). b) Memorial Park Museum Kragujevac: seeing a site I had read about added extra levels of understanding, emotions, and questions (eg. messages in the guest books comparing events of 1990s triggered delicate almost competitive memories).

2. Tito's Mausoleum and the building of the former Executive Council of Yugoslavia – this visit brought me to a past where apparently peace and brotherhood were in the founding bricks of the country before the war came. Also, the bombed TV building, an image that I remember from the news in 1999.

3. If I have to choose I think that Batajnica is one of the strongest moments/ places for me. Because it's a non-memorial place where nothing is visible and because we got very strong/ clear explanations from Jasmina and Alma. - The other place is the Palace of Serbia: it raised a lot of questions concerning our constant interrogation: What do we want this building to reflect? The shape of it changed because it reflected Yugoslavia unity and how it is still used, but it reflects Serbia's rewriting of history/ erasing of the past. In this context the informal contributions of our group were particular enlightening. But there are many informal moments I will also remember because of the quality and sincerity of the discussions.

4. I will remember the visit to Batajnica suburb area. I cannot really explain why, but I thought it was quite a moving moment, and it was a place to see maybe because it is in a middle of where people live

and work and without explanation, it goes unnoticed. I will also remember the meeting in CK 13 in Novi Sad because I really liked the place and the atmosphere. The people we met there were also really interesting and dedicated. A good memory.

5. Presentation of C31: because it was a very good presentation, because the program and approach are intriguing, because it fitted to the place we visited, because it is a member of Memory Lab.

6. One moment is connected to the visit of the building of the former Executive Council of Yugoslavia. Although I expected a lot of that visit and was informed on how well the place is designed, it nevertheless surpassed all my expectations. Although I am not a big fan of ceremonial buildings and spending a lot of money on demonstrating state power I felt a bit 'guilty' for being so privileged to have seen the building and all its richness. My parents and grandparents who have partially financed the construction of that building and lived the idea of that very Yugoslavia, have never had the opportunity to see it. I felt how powerful the SFRY was in the symbolic sense. - The second most remembered moment is Svabo's observation of the visit to the 'House of Flowers'. He remembered how he went to the place in the 1980s, and the place had the atmosphere of entering a holy place, a temple of o God Tito. And now he has observed how it became just a regular museum where you can casually come to and behave as you want. This is an interesting example how the context completely changes what you think of the place and how you 'feel' it.

7. Conflicts about (national) identity on the Balkans. On several occasions there were arguments about the fact, which everybody from BSC seemed to know, what a Serb etc. is and it got quite aggressive, when I or other people tried to criticize this idea of ethnicity. I will have to reflect my point of view on that and hopefully the others will do the same as well. - The temporary museum of Tito/ Yugoslav history. Gives me a lot to think about narrating history through objects and exhibitions.

8. "We don't have to worry about the future for it is bright. We need to worry about the past because it is constantly changing." → Very powerful and frightening and definitely something I will keep in mind in my professional as well as personal life. - The museum of Yugoslav history: it has all the potential for being a typical historical museum: specific periods in specific region, big collection, space, great location, scientific research available, and people interested and still it is not really living up to expectations, not fulfilling potential.

9. One sentence that will stay on my mind is : "One Sumarice is enough for the world." This is such a powerful sentence that reminds us all of the horrors of wars and the need to perform dealing with the past properly and adequately in order to prevent perpetrating of hatred for the 'other'. - Also, I was struck by the overtaking of the memorial spaces by orthodox churches.

10. – Visit to the Museum of Yugoslav History. - The story of the memorial to the victims of wars in the 1990s. - The newly erected churches in Kragujevac memorial park, in Batajnica and in Sremski Front Museum.

11. The meals and the free time -> to have some time and space to get together and talk to each other was great! To discuss views on topics, how someone dealt with it and to exchange ideas etc. - The long way

the Balkan has to take to –kind of- overcome nationalism. To focus on human rights and individuals and not on labels like ethnicity or from which nation somebody comes from.

12. a) conversations with Christian Melka from the Les Milles Memorial near Marseille → focusing the processes of exclusion etc. which lead to mass crimes resonates deeply with me. b) Maša Avramović and her team → the unspectacular and usual NGO way of dealing with the past. Maša as person, professional, activist is a huge discovery! She is great!

13. The place which will stay especially in my memory along all the others was the Memorial Park in Kragujevac. I realized for myself that I like this concept of a memorial park. The visitor can walk around, enjoy the nature and has the opportunity to see these very abstract and beautiful monuments in a not forced way. Every visitor is free to ask questions to the place and to find an own approach to dealing with the past. - Furthermore, I am still thinking about the discussion about ethnicity, citizenship and nationality in Novi Sad. The reactions of some people concerning this were very emotional and rough. Even for myself these topics regarding the Balkans are not so easy to understand. I can imagine that this is very emotional issue but we cannot learn more about it if no one explains in a calm and reasonable voice.

14. Topic in introductory session (dancing tables): “your link to Serbia” → triggered many interesting reactions. - Two participants from Serbia, one: ” I will tell you why I am disconnected from Serbia”, another: “I worked on myself to be a Serb” → troubled identities. - “You can find all kinds of historians confirming all kind of truth in this country”: O. Manojlović-Pintar → she didn’t or couldn’t provide us with an overview of contemporary history of Serbia, instead she spoke about Yugoslavia.

15. a) “We don’t need to worry about our future, for its bright; we need to worry about our past for it changes all the time.”: Very striking way of warning against presentism which I will quote very regularly. b) The letters of the victims of the raids in Kragujevac moved me very deeply as a human being. This proves once again that the way of presenting a historical event determines if it stays with people or not.

16. Memorial Park and museum of Kragujevac because I really did not know this history (just on surface) of occupation and repression and I didn’t really observe this form of memorialisation before. - Told, untold, and retold histories on WWII with Milovan Pissari because I think that I knew this history before coming, but it was really a moment to fix this history and to have a best reflection. - So, those 2 moments as discovery for the first and deepening for the second.

17. Kragujevac visit as it was the first visit to the town and memorial. I had a previous knowledge/ memory (as one of the historical events we learnt about) and expectations. So I saw ‘the’ place. But also witnessed the new trends, present in the region elsewhere too, of revisionism and reinterpretations of history. For me it was for the first time to see them in museological presentations. - “All victims stories should be presented in ML”, was a sentence that was said during the group discussions and which strikes me for two reasons: How to find the right approach and construct a dialogue with the representatives of the victims and their right on the truth? And secondly, understanding that we still have to approach the memory issues from the perspective of balancing the number of victims from all sides.

18. I must say that Thursday 13th has been for me very rich in inputs, impressions, reflections and feelings. a) The visit of Kragujevac Memorial Park (either by bus or by foot) → the place is so huge, the

different sculptures, scattered all over the land, despite the personal taste of visitors, have a real function and are not by any mean spoiling the landscape. In this quiet and somehow bucolic place one can think about what happened there. Moreover, the fact that on the edge of the Park people (Roms?) very picking up cutted grass , gave to me a positive impression: life is going on and really there among the mass graves of those who leaved there. b) I was touched by the, relative, awkwardness of the lady doing the lecture about workers Union and the tough arguments which happened then.

Everything, the thing we live, the experiences we had to suffer, are very acute.

19. Many crucial moments counted for me in this seminar; the importance varies according to different criteria, goals and issues; but I prefer those that would not have been possible if the seminar in Belgrade had not occurred on site. Visiting the ruins of the concentration of the Second World War camp Staro Sajmiste tremendously impressed me. Visiting this abandoned site, victim of oblivion, made me more aware of the importance of essential memorial work and memorialization processes that allows through the history and conservation of sites testify to learn from the past to the present and to the future. Memory as Reverence becomes a memory as Reference in order to the genocidal crimes do not recur. It is necessary to maintain understanding and mastering of keys to decrypt the gears leading to genocide and to remain vigilant. Sajmiste is extremely symbolic in its abandonment; the meeting with the Memory Lab's friends and their will to resist oblivion really stood and impressed me. - The other point that I stress is the involvement and concern to meet most of the participants of the seminar and hear their stories, their opinions. All the moments of interpersonal encounters and small groups workshops are an asset of the seminar; these moments are complemented by all times of meals, friendly informal encounters, city walks or during interactive and creative moments.

20. a) The discovery of the Kragujevac Memorial Park: From photos I knew the “Interrupted flight”- Monument, but I did not suspect that this is really a big park with a lot of monuments at different places, all related to the same event of 1941, and with a museum in the center of it. So it was a real discovery, and I don't think I have seen this concept before. b) A more intimate moment: during one small group-exercise, one participant told a very personal story about his own family's involvement in Second World War, and how he discovered this recently.

21. The lecture of Orli Fridman about the 1990s because it reflected and analyzed the latest developments in Serbia. - The debriefing discussion after the memory walks was very interesting to follow because participants reflected on their impressions and their own personal memories to places and periods of the past. - The many interesting informal talks with colleagues about their professional experiences and memory practices and discourse. It is so insightful and inspiring to hear about their experiences, what they work on, what questions drive them to do the work they do, professionally and personally.

22. Memorial Park Šumarice / Kragujevac, because of its size and the size of the monuments, but more than anything because of feelings it awoke in me. It was my impression it could be of European importance if raised in some way, to a higher level. - I will keep in my memory meeting with a representative of the Trade Union in Kragujevac because all her ideas and statements were presented with certain dose of caution, maybe fear; so it drew my attention to growing problem of destruction of working class and entire epoch of industrial development, but also lack of this topic in public discourse.

23. The two moments are: visit to Batajnica and the discussion with the Union representative from Kragujevac. - The significance of the first lays in similarity to Tomašica mass grave in vicinity of Prijedor, in terms of involvement of the system and institutions not only in creation but also in but in concealment of these mass graves, role of media and spreading of propaganda and other aspects. During this visit to this location I came to a conclusion that same or very similar mechanisms stand behind these crimes. - Relevance of the second moment lays in a stand that story about transitional justice and social justice are completely interwoven and inseparable, while we are witnesses that in practice these two concepts do not come across each other a lot. This encounter provided us with an insight into complexity of the overall process.

24. Kragujevac and story on labour movement, as it is a continuation of something that I see as untold narrative about the 1990's in Serbia (economic decline, poverty, collapse of workers) and how difficult it is for us to place and understand this narrative in the context of the 1990's in the region; unexamined dichotomy of urban and rural in context of anti-regime – regime in Serbia (but also other in other countries in the region) that we briefly discussed during the walk.

25. 1) Dialogue on the extent of relevance of the study trip for each of us and for problematizing of our context and memorialisation within the context (“creative evaluation” during the last day) as the platform for a true dialogue and exchange of dilemmas, difficult topics and emotions that were frequently present, was opened. 2) The fact that even when each of us intends to be constructive and share own perspectives, often it is difficult to comprehend that such perspectives are “ours” and that there are alternative ones. That was something I was thinking about after reflections on the walks through Belgrade. 3) Importance of widening of perspectives (e.g. economic)

26. I was mostly impressed by the visit to Dedinje and Tito's grave, because of a personal connection with the place and experiencing it from totally new perspective and longer time distance. Another place is Kragujevac, squalor and devastation, of both factories and the museum.

27. Study tour to Topovske šupe and Sajmište: places of crime, and yet so much ignored. I did not have enough information about these places. General experience is shared, and what was presented was an excellent material that I would use for development of my methodology for education about genocide in the World War Two.

28. I was particularly impressed by the visit of the monument to the victims of the raid in Novi Sad, and the story about forced conscription we heard in CK 13. I was deeply touched by description of how people were killed and thrown under the ice and it made me think; and I did not know anything about the forced conscriptions.

29. In addition to historical revisionism, religious buildings that are being placed on locations of scaffolds (not finished yet) represent a serious issue for me. Branko Miljković : *“And may it be the beginning and the end / of the world which would have their name and our hands / here where history spoke out loud / here where they left their blood to glow / here where earth and water and air live off of their death”*

30. Visit to the Sremski front Museum, because it has specifics in its layout, but also in its relation towards fascism as significant determinant of the commemorating event. - Visit to the museum in

Kragujevac, “Šumarice” Memorial because of the insight in revisionism tendency that is recognisable and more and more applicable in Serbia; but also as a special memory site as the execution in Kragujevac is an important segment of my collective/public memory.

31. Visit to the Sremski front Memorial and discussion about possibility of non-ideological memorialisation. Discussion with two participants during one of the evenings, exchange of experience with them. Laughter and professional exchange in an excellent balance. And Topolivnica [Weapon Factory Museum in Kragujevac] (as a place that needs to be talked about and we did not do that)

32. The visit to Staro Sajmište and Topovske šupe. I haven't had an opportunity to visit these locations before and to see the conditions and the lack of marking.

33. - Sremski front – this is a place that I haven't visited before and I got impression that is quite forgotten, I believe it has a great potential due to its specific location (vicinity of the border between Serbia and Croatia). - Visit to Batajnica had a great impact on me. This is about an event that took place only 16 years ago and it reminds us that crimes are always possible and that is necessary to take all possible steps to prevent these things to repeat. As someone who comes from Serbia, Batajnica is very important especially because of total absence of this place in public space and dominant narratives.

34. The “Gate” of Kragujevac had the strongest impression on me. On one side there is a FIAT sign, and on the other, there is Orthodox cross. I believe that these two symbols are carriers of the frame, a slit through which suitable memories are let/regulated/constituted.

35. Regardless to the fact I am familiar with the context of Serbia and the region I still feel shocked with the intensity of insisting on religious symbols at memorial sites and within the context of memorialisation culture. Another moment is related to Kragujevac and I would emphasize three things: A cross and FIAT sign at the entrance that fully indicates a state of memorialisation culture in Serbia, and a sentence said by the lady from the Union :” If you come here next year you might find nobody to talk to”.

36. Sremski front: ortodoxization, sufferings of the national-liberation war fighters. - Kragujevac museum – sentence on a museum ticket: « ...and 23 children, age of 12 to 15, mostly Gipsies, little shoe polishers. »

37. The 1990's walk in Belgrade in rainy and squally weather; challenging task, both personally and professionally. - Discussion about forced mobilisations in 1990-'s as I did not know almost anything about that. - The first time a team-member, new and nice experience.

Question 3: Concerning the topic “Told, untold, retold histories”, to what extent did this week provide you with new insights / knowledge / questions?

1. One intriguing sentence was “1990s is still the present, therefore we cannot talk about retold history yet”: to what extent, then, in volatile situations and so close to events, is a narrative retold. - This week also showed me again a certain discrepancy between activism/ memory work and an anthropological awareness of complexities of narratives, the everyday experience, the dichotomy organization – citizens, came with the questions on what is the ‘pedagogical’ role of NGO, and what, on the other hand is learning for communities and anthropological/ empathetic engagements... A hard question, to which there is no simple answer.
2. The chosen topic for this year automatically made me think about how the past is addressed in my country. I could see some initiatives developed in Serbia that are identical to some post-conflict decisions taken in my country on the memorial field, such as victimisation of only certain groups.
3. This trip succeeded in tackling this issue very well for expected and non-expected reasons. The diversity of the age of the participants, their own experience of the war in the 1990s gave us a great look on the complexity of the told-untold history. The fact that the question of what means ‘nationalities’ in the Balkans was not explicated but that this issue was always in a hidden way present was very strong. The diversity of our background, experience (survivors, activists, researchers, cultural workers...) is also bringing a complex and rich overview.
4. What I have learned during the week about this topic is, that is a lot more complicated to refer to “told, untold and retold stories” than it seems in the first place. As we have learned this week, on many levels, this work is still in progress in Serbia and this topic and the very definition of these three kinds of stories is fluctuating, especially in this country.
5. Complexity even on that level – each story is told, untold, retold.
6. This visit opened, or at least underlined two major questions for me. First is how do we remember socialist past, how do we preserve it and to whom does it belong to. The second thing is how can we tackle the issue of nationalizing anti-fascism, the process that exists in both Serbia and Croatia? If we don’t need the remembrance of the anti-fascist struggle, what form of remembrance do we need?
7. I would have liked to have a session on the definition of these concepts. This would have been more useful than the lectures on the first day (esp. 1 and 2) that were not helpful. Because of that this is a bit blurry to me.
8. The paradigm in itself: “told, untold and retold” is something that I will take home and apply to my work as well as to my country’s history. Before I looked like it was told but now I am beginning to realize that most of it is retold and even untold. -Also the way that this country’s current situation. Its history from the 1990’s, Yugoslav-period, WWII and even WWI is so actively intertwined. Not in a cause-and-effect kind of way, but in a very complicated, multi-layer-way.

9. I learned to question what I already had heard about the history of WWII and I explored a little bit more the era of Tito in Yugoslavia and the madness revolving the ‘cult of personality’. What remained untold, though, is the relation of Yugoslavia to the world.

10. My insights: The history of Yugoslavia (Tito) an untold story The official Serbian policy of internalizing and nationalizing the conflicts – a story to be told.

11. That I am – even more I was already aware of – not a fan of nationalism and how important a shared European idea is.

12. Forced conscription and persecution of Croatian population in Vojvodina → I knew little about that, but Jelena’s presentation gave me new information, opened many perspectives I was not aware of. The same time it became clear to me that Serbia (Serbian society, NGOs, etc.) faces many challenges that are unknown to us living outside Serbia. I have noticed that those of us coming from BiH primarily spot all details that confirm our stands about Serbia (sometimes they are prejudice) and that we are having difficulties to open up for new insights.

13. During the last days I learned a lot about told, untold and retold history in Serbia. Most of the topics were completely new for me. I also realize that I have more questions than before. I would like to know more about the economical situation of Serbia during the 1990s and also about the role of Serbia during WWII. Therefore, the program helped me to develop these questions and raise my interest to study more.

14. a) There is a semantic error in the motto. It shouldn’t be “told, untold, retold histories” but “... stories”. We are discussing perceptions, perspectives, and uses of the past. We don’t discuss s history here. It seems that there is a historical void or vacuum in contemporary Serbia. The basic facts about contemporary Serbian history are not authorised. There is a lack of institutions that would authorise those facts. B) I realised – through Maša’s presentation of the Museum of the past for the future - that in order to use history for enlarging the human potential to grow you should be precise in identifying the objectives of your work (your issues and values), but not brand your work with it- it becomes normative if not.

15. The paradigm will be of great use in my future work. Of course, I was aware of this complex process of (non-)memorialization, but seeing it in extreme forms in this context will make me more sensitive to more subtle attempts of retelling history in my own context.

16. Good topic for any country. I didn’t really have new questions after the week because I had them, for */illegible/*, before coming. And, it’s really personal, some extra problems (at home) impeach me to really concentrated on every subjects. Sorry for that!

17. The topic ‘told, untold and retold histories’ sounds catchy and well-chosen but I am not sure if we approached and tackled it in a satisfying way. In fact, I am not sure if it would be possible at all. I cannot say I deepened my knowledge on the topics discussed within the program, maybe because none of the three topics were problematized deeper. Kosovo issue which belongs to told, untold and retold category with the most symbolic way is, for example, not tackled at all.

18. Certainly new knowledge of the subject, including the situation in Serbia. A lot nourishing conversation with participants. The lectures themselves have also given to me new approaches and fed my reflection on the topic → new ideas, new projects for the future.

19. At Camp des Milles Foundation in Aix-en-Provence we work a lot on these topics but concerning the Second World War, the Vichy regime and the Holocaust. We extend our reflexive work to the organization of studies, seminar, training sessions, cultural and educational actions in order to fight against anti-Semitism, racism, xenophobia and extremism. I can see the importance and relevance of the work to our audiences that often ignore many things about History and have no opportunities to think in terms of risk of this face of rising intolerance, rejection of the other and fascination towards authoritarian powers. Yet there has been very useful to attend the seminar in order to understand "in vivo" the report of each participant to very painful and specific events of the Holocaust and in the Balkans wars in the former Yugoslavia. I find the speech and analyzing each representing a different group but in which everyone can be truly considered as a victim. I discovered the need for distancing and necessary time to study, to understand and to move beyond the legitimate victimization process which requests for time, recognition and justice. This work is essential. This approach, I believe, really opens a horizon to the mission of the Foundation of the Camp des Milles. Our Histories, cultures, people are different, but the process is proving to be very comparable. Balkan issues are both specific and universal.

20. I think it was a very good idea to chose such a title for the program and come back to this title as a red thread again and again during the program. These terms can be applied for any country. For me, before this program, these were just terms, which I used more or less automatically; the program made me understand for example how much told, untold and re-told stories are intertwined. After this week I will use these terms in much more conscious and also in much more careful way.

21. The "memory walk" with Milovan Pissari was very insightful as I had started recently working on the Holocaust the Jews and Roma in Macedonia. It was very interesting to visit the places where the crimes were committed during WWII and observe their current state, use and all the controversies connected to them. The experience strengthened my idea to possibly continue working on those topics in Macedonia. The visit to Kragujevac memorial site helped me get a better understanding of the dominant discourse of past victimization in Serbia. The presentation in the arms factory museum and the about the workers' decline served as a good "reality check" to get a glimpse of the often prevailing state of denial of involvement/responsibility for the wars in Yugoslavia in the 1990s.

22. As far as a concept of this study trip is concerned I believe it is real hit as proved in practice. Unfortunately, very often places, people and events we engaged with confirmed dark prognoses on revisionism that spreads all over Europe, affects and changes thesis and place vagueness around the past.

23. The topic of the workshop "told, untold and retold narratives" corresponds well with context of Serbia in which we were placed. Starting from a presumption that culture of memorialisation is a field of political fight , it is clear that some narratives from the past are placed for that particular purpose, and some of them are being forgotten, some are being forced, whereas some of them are being changed. In

addition, the selected concept of the workshop topic enabled us to compare different past related narratives.

24. I believe this is a continuation of the previous answer. Although it would not be bad idea to spend more time in the very beginning of Memory Lab to clarify some basic concepts, to set some kind of a framework for understanding of a context, and to more clearly present dominant narratives in order to achieve smoother group discussions. - Walking through the streets of Belgrade of 90's was particularly important to me, for that self-reflection and notion of how the 1990's are still an uncompleted and unexamined narrative to me.

25. Told, untold and re-told histories are so often interwoven that maybe none of the narratives is told to the end, and maybe it could not be fully told. A lot of effort is needed to recognize untold parts of narratives within the narratives we are told or are familiar with. And that is where lays the key of a dialogue and opening of the new perspectives and empathy.

26. Participating in this program enabled me to get an insight in current situation at the very spot, in Serbia, especially in terms of its current memorialisation policy and extent of revisionism of the socialistic past.

27. I would "take over" the entire concept or I would add it into my Curriculum /program I have for education of youth on the WWII genocide (Roma Holocaust).

28. Since I myself deal with these issues in Serbia, and I take part in many different initiatives and projects and cooperate with institutions we have visited, I am familiar with good deal of issues, but naturally there are things, like stories about conscription, trade union, ... that I have heard for the first time in my life. Some of the stories have changed my perspectives.

29. The past week mostly showed me a need to reassess my own positions in terms of our history, past and how at the same time it is not rewarding to be a part/an actor in current political processes.

30. We have got a good insight, in spite the fact that revisionism of the past was not particularly problematized as an element of retold stories.

31. Most of the visited sites were known to me, therefore I mostly */illegible/* in revealing perception of domestic issues from the perspective of people that are not to burdened with the facts and participation in the processes we observed.

32. I think that many questions have been raised, and they require deeper and more detailed research.

33. The greatest insight in relation to three types of narratives is the fact that each location/event /narrative holds within all three aspects. In my opinion such division is very difficult, but at the same time a useful mechanism for understanding of evolution of narratives in society.

34. Told histories: in this category, it was valuable experience for me to map again fight for workers' rights as presented by the trade union representative in Kragujevac. The history of labourer movement (rights... regardless how many times told it is still open and "fresh") - Untold histories: visit of Batajnica

and of the black house in Novi Sad, and discussions about topics we started at those locations, for someone from Serbia, like myself, are histories about which I know the least, the ones least talked about in Serbia, and therefore I am grateful for the opportunity for those narratives to be paid attention to during our study trip. - Retold histories: Kragujevac and the Yugoslav History Museum. Although I knew the most about these locations before our study trip, the dynamic of the group and the group observations made me see new “moments” which I haven’t noticed before, or which I did not treat with due attention.

35. Many narratives and histories that we had opportunity to hear have fully integrated into my considerations. How many untold, forgotten, suppressed, covered histories are there and it is only the question how to return them to a course of told histories. Indeed, I received a lot in this context by participation in this study trip.

36. Attempts of revision of the past and writing of some new history may be seen at almost any step in Serbia. Rehabilitation of Chetniks’ movement has been almost fully completed. Glamorous monuments, museums and memorial centres are being built on locations of suffering of Serbian people (Kragujevac, etc.) whereas sites of suffering of Jewish and Roma people (Topovske šupe - Belgrade, Sajmište camp, etc.) and mass graves of Albanians from Kosovo (Batajnica) remain unmarked.

37. In spite the fact that I am well acquainted with context of Serbia, I’ve gained quite a few new insights, directions for thinking, and possible actions. Some personal priorities in this field have become more clear, and there are topics I would like to get to know more about, and some I would like to work on. - New contacts from this Memory Lab, will also be very valuable. - Issue of war and post-war economy seems important but not investigated. In addition, the entire issue of economic background of memorialisation policies in context of Serbia is important and interesting.

Question 4: Suggestions for the future (concerning the annual workshop/study trip and/or Memory Lab in general)

1. This year’s schedule included some free time in urban sites (e.g. Novi Sad), but it was just enough (or not even) for dinner. I would suggest that when the study trip takes the group to a city/village rather than just a memorial, to have some free time for exploration – places make sense more if you can enjoy with them in a non-directed way. So, perhaps 2h free in unknown city and later return would be welcome.

2. Very short and not really important suggestion: the first day it could be really useful a quick presentation of everybody (name +place + institution) in front of the whole group, not only in small working groups.

3. I would like to say: Let’s continue this way! It’s unique and great experience! Perhaps, we need more explanations of the concepts related to the country we are in (their nationalities, identities, rule of activists in country where academics are not reliable).

4. I think it would be interesting to work in the next Memory Lab meeting about international brigades and what it meant in the European history. Hopefully, the organisation of study trip/workshop will be kept as it is.
5. Keep exchange at beginning (- info market, future topics of interest). - Have (more) small group works and discussions. - As much insights, information, discussions on how dealing with the past is necessary, healthy vs. amnesia, forgetting, leaving it. How do both approaches impact on societies over a longer period /generations
6. Regarding the concept, it is more or less OK. I would maybe include more time for developing new projects, but that can be done informally as well. - For the next Memory Lab we will for sure tackle the Civil War and Franco's dictatorship, but I would like if we tackled the issue of colonialism or at least in past, is today the period of Maur's rule in Spain looked upon (from 8th to the 15th century). - Regarding the 2018 Memory Lab I propose a Croatia based one with maybe Mostar (where periods of both the 1990 and WWII can be observed). In Croatia besides Knin-storm, we can visit Goli Otok, Rab concentration camp, etc.
7. Problems regarding the tension between urban/local, regional and national memory in Barcelona would be very interesting to address. -> and regional nationalism and memory in general. Transition from dictatorship to democracy. Dealing with sites of memory from the civil war that have been erected during the dictatorship. I would like to focus only on Spain, not France as well. It is complex enough already. Migrant organizations and national memory or urban/local memory in Barcelona would also be interesting.
8. Suggestions: I think it could be interesting to include in the program the participants of this group in an actual memory activity in the visited country. To gain a participants perspective on top of a spectator's one. - Thank you for an amazing week.
9. We should be involved in more creative exercises with specific questions arising during museum visits. Also, where possible, do direct observations around memorials and see how ordinary citizens interact with them.
10. Is there a chance to distribute the experiences/ insights of Memory Lab to other organizations (EU)? Expansion of Memory Lab to Hungary?
11. See 1. - Find another way of presenting the participants even if it's kind of boring, it would be nice if everybody will have a short presentation like 'My name is... I am from/ I am living in... and I am working in the field of/ with the topic of...' -> also the organizers.! - Would be nice to stress out before that single room is not obligatory. - To start the week with stressing out, what it's about → if it's about to start/continue a meta-discussion do it. - Spanish Civil War: Franco's grave site ; the villages named after Franco. Struggle for independence and the way Spain is dealing with ETA etc. How Spain is dealing with it's colonial past.
12. I think it would be very good to broaden war crimes topic on other aspects of war past (all of this was already said, so I will not enlist suggestions) →make link between war violence and post-war violence

more visible (or maybe even a dynamics of violence before, during, and after the war). - Thank you for everything!

13. For future Memory Lab workshops and study trips there is at the moment one thing I would suggest. The first day should be definitely a proper introduction day in the past of the specific place. The lectures which took place on Monday were not well prepared for this purpose. I hardly heard anything about Serbia during WWII for example and the contemporary history of Serbia was left out or not really systematic. It was always underlined that the participants don't have the same base of knowledge, it should be tried to make this one. Maybe also of working groups could be established were different (specific) past periods or events can be discussed with 'local' participant that they can explain more to other participants.

14. Reflect agency better and our own historical embeddedness : start with the family history and get rid of this national paradigm: the task to link experiences from here to "my country" produces again a national container with which I do not identify with. I can link what I learnt here to my knowledge and experiences. But let me decide whether I want to choose a national paradigm for that! - Please historical data about the places we visit like in the first study trips for orientation.

15. Foresee more time for a proper introduction in the local context. The three lectures at the first day weren't enough as far as I'm concerned. Ask external experts (and all speakers) to bring a PowerPoint as a visual support. This makes things easier to follow, certainly for those who are not familiar with the local language. - However I really enjoyed the visit of the 'Socialist Yugoslavia', I was also disappointed that I could not participate in the other visits. The presentations afterwards made this even more striking. Of course, this system allows to gain more knowledge for the group as a whole, but maybe there is still another way I can't think of right now.

16. I haven't really suggestions because I don't feel really legitimate or enough legitimate for that. The idea is good, the process is good too. I just think it's probably good to involve more historians as participants or as a guide.

17. Looking forward to learn more about Spain next year.

18. –

19. I propose to continue the reflection on a possible participation of the Foundation of the Camp des Milles this platform; this requires the agreement and commitment of the leaders of the Foundation may hold a seminar in Aix-en-Provence (France). - The link between the UNESCO Chair Convergence of briefs and citizenship seems to me very interesting. The Foundation also works with major memorial networks; all these links can afford pooling of our public service and our commitments and values.

20. For next year in Spain : the dealing with Spanish civil war and its legacies (from the Franco dictatorship until time) could be a great opportunity to tackle the more universal question about « How much forgetting do we need, how much memory do we need to reconstruct a society ? ». I think it is also important not only go to Barcelona ; we should also go to Madrid in order to see different perspectives. -

For the program itself : Have more time and go deeper into the reflexion about the visited sites, perhaps also in combination with some creative exercises (as we had for example in Belgium with the exercise about European history Museum), also during the visits not only do guided visits, but alternate more often with self-exploratory methods and/or with tasks to discover the site. - Another thing : I think through the introduction of the « common ground »-principles at the beginning, we avoided the sometimes negative atmosphere within the group we had last year, but in the same time it creates a new challenge : how to create a space where can be expressed controversial opinions in a constructive way ?

21. - Keep the high-quality program and participants. - Keep the organizing team and open it up to new colleagues every year. - Hold one full introduction round in the very beginning (I know that it is lengthy with 40 people, but it is important to hear all the names of the participants and their professional backgrounds once). - The market place could be bigger, i.e. more colleagues could have presented their work regardless whether they have brought promotion material or not. I learnt about colleagues' interesting projects and organisations only later during the week. - Stop the rain ! :-)

22. My proposal for future Memory Lab is a greater focus on intangible memory culture /personal histories/ , interaction with “ordinary people”, etc.

23. Since the group of participants is big, this time it was difficult to provide sufficient space and time for discussions, therefore the only suggestion is related to a need to use more available space for discussions.

24. I hope that the group project will be a success, and I believe the topic is great and relevant. I have already given a proposal for some “stronger” introductory workshops; better moderation of discussion, and somehow I did not hear some people I felt important to hear. I do not know what would be solution for that, but I think this issue requires certain considerations.

25. To work harder to explain what means participation in a “memory laboratory”.

26. As far as suggestion for the future are concerned, instead of printing of a programme on premium quality paper use UMBRELLAs :-)

27. More guests, researchers for these topics, more professionals, academics, PhDs, and organisations that have good thesis on this topic (WWII). Place – link – history heritage – link to-WWII- Roma people.

28. I believe that in future we should address in more details topics set as the study trip title, even if there are not that many of them. I also believe that some principles for moderation and facilitation of discussions should be established as to prevent disrespect, verbal attacks and falling into non-critical and unconstructive controversies.

29. In the context of this year Memory Lab I would have liked if we had an opportunity to talk to actors who were directly involved and fought against the war i.e. were part of anti-war campaign.

30. It would be interesting to study a model of public memory of the Civil War in Spain, as they have positive solutions that may be inspirational for countries of the Balkans. - Another suggestion for the

Memory Lab study trip is Italy, as it has its specific roles in the two World Wars, and naturally in a context of beginning of fascism and heritage of that totalitarianism.

31. For the future Memory Lab study trip, it would be good to ensure more time for discussions and reflections on seen/visited places. It is OK for us to observe and notice, but it would also be good to discuss about the seen things without fear from */illegible/*. Issue of memorialisation of the past and today's life is interesting only if we succeed in establishing a correlation between these two categories- both levels are interesting (past and present) only if the causal link is analysed. It would be good that is not missed in the forthcoming gatherings.

32. Better balance of representatives in all groups- nations from the war in former Yugoslavia; provision of better historic framework, better moderation and facilitation of discussions, and higher level of tolerance during discussions, respect for everyone.

33. - It would be very interesting to include people from more different countries in order to increase range of perspectives of the study trip. - I think that quality of interaction within the program would increase if brief, respective biographies follow the names of participants; it may be useful and interesting to have a list of all participants on Memory Lab project website. - More time for analysis of own perspectives and understanding of specific contexts from which we come.

34. More dialogue and less "horizontal" presentations – visiting of museums included. - Thank you very much!

35. My suggestion to the Memory Lab team is to continue to organise this kind of study trips in future as it was excellent. I have no complaints about organisation, content or quality of participants. In addition, when Spain is concerned, maybe it would be better to pay attention to art and culture, and its modes of dealing with the past.

36. –

37. At this moment I do not have any specific suggestion, however when something crosses my mind, I'll present it. Thank you!