

OFAJ  
DFJW

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

**YHR**

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

## Memory Lab

*Trans-European Exchange Platform for Critical Understanding of History and Remembrance*

### **“Conflicting memories, communicating memories?” Fourth annual study trip and workshop, 20-26.10.2013: Berlin, Frankfurt/Oder-Slubice, Ravensbrück**

Organized by the Youth Initiative for Human Rights BiH,  
Documenta-Centar for Dealing with the past, the French-German Youth Office  
and the Centre André Malraux Sarajevo  
In cooperation with the Institute for Applied History Frankfurt/Oder, the Berlin Wall  
Memorial and the Educational Services of the Memorial Centar Ravensbrück

Stiftung  
Brandenburgische  
Gedenkstätten

Mahn- und  
Gedenkstätte  
Ravensbrück

SträÙe der Nationen  
16719 FÖrstenberg  
Telefon: 033093 / 608-0  
Telefax: 033093 / 608-29



Institut für  
angewandte  
Geschichte

**STIFTUNG BERLINER MAUER**

# FINAL REPORT

The project has been funded by:  
German Federal Foreign Office, Robert Bosch Foundation, CCFD-Terre Solidaire



Embassy  
of the Federal Republic of Germany  
Sarajevo

Rot



Stabilitätspakt für Südosteuropa  
Gefördert durch Deutschland  
Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe  
Sponsored by Germany



## Final Report

1. General information on the organizers
2. Aims
3. Preparation
4. Implementation
  - 4.1. Project content and development
  - 4.2. Methods
  - 4.3. Participants
5. Evaluation by the participants
6. Suggestions for future study trips and workshops
7. Conclusions and future perspectives
8. Annexes:
  - Program
  - Participants list
  - Participants of the reception organized by “Memory Lab” in Berlin

### 1. General information on the organizers

- **Youth Initiative for Human Rights BiH**, Sarajevo: Objectives and activities: Advancing the participation of youth in democratization 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. 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 years have for example been the “Srebrenica – Mapping Genocide”-project and summer camps for young activists from the region in Kozarac.

- 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. Among other activities, *Documenta* is regularly organizing educational study trips to sites of memory related to the 1941-1945 period in Croatia, Bosnia and Serbia.

- 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 is especially cooperating with Memorials in France, as the Memorial Centar of Oradour and the Mémorial de la Shoah in Paris, and has for example organized, together with the Jewish Community BiH and the Mémorial de la Shoah, in 2013 in Paris a training seminar on Holocaust education for history teachers from Sarajevo.

- The **Berlin Wall Memorial** was created after Berlin's city government adopted in 2006 a decentralized plan to commemorate the history of the Berlin Wall and the city's post-war division. As an integral plan of this decentralized concept, the Berlin Wall foundation was established in September of 2008. Upon completion, the facilities, situated in the midst of the Wall's former death strip, will encompass circa 4,4 hectares. The Berlin Wall Foundation runs the National Monument dedicated to the memory of the of the divided city and the victims of Communist tyranny, the Open-Air-Exhibition with the Window of Remembrance on the former border strip along Bernauer Strasse and the adjacent Documentation and Visitors Centre.

- Operating at the German-Polish border, the **Institute for Applied History** in Frankfurt/Oder fosters exchange on historical perceptions in Europe. It conducts projects and research addressing sensitive issues of memory culture with a particular emphasis on regions shaped by borders. The Institute for Applied History was established in 2005 as a non-governmental organisation by researchers and alumni of the European University "Viadrina". The work of the Institute is divided into three areas: 1) Analysis of European Remembrance 2) Polish-German trans-border region 3) didactics of intercultural historical education.

- The **Ravensbrück Memorial Site** is the memorial site on the historical grounds of the Ravensbrück Concentration Camp complex, internationally known as the former Women's Concentration Camp (approx. 130,000 prisoners). The memorial site, as part of the (state-sponsored) Brandenburg Foundation of Memorials (Stiftung Brandenburgische Gedenkstätten) provides all kinds of museum's, scholarly and educational activities. Educational activities include guided tours, international youth meetings at the "International Youth Meeting Centre" and European Summer-University (annually). The Memorial Site is

member of ICOM MEMO, participating in national and international projects, and organizing teacher-trainings for e.g. Dutch, Hungarian, Polish, Czech and US-American teachers.

The team:

- Tamara Banjeglav, project coordinator at Documenta - Centar for Dealing with the past
- Dr. Matthias Heyl, Head of the Educational Services at the Ravensbrück Memorial Site
- Alma Mašić, director of the Youth Initiative for Human Rights BiH
- Dr. Nicolas Moll, historian and consultant for the Centre Malraux Sarajevo
- Frank Morawietz, special coordinator of the FGYO for South Eastern Europe
- Juliane Tomann, Project manager at the Institute for Applied History

## **2. Aims**

General aims of the platform “Memory Lab”:

The trans-European exchange platform “Memory Lab”, created in 2010/2011 under the name “Dealing with difficult pasts in Western Europe and the Western Balkans”, brings together organizations, institutions and persons working on memory sites and remembrance education in the Western Balkans and in Western/Central Europe, and promotes thereby exchange, cooperation and critical understanding of remembrance and history in Europe. In this framework, the annual study trips and workshops are particular important occasions for mutual learning through the sharing of experiences and practices. The platform and the annual meetings aim to overcome existing gaps of knowledge, to strengthen constructive dealing-with-the-past-approaches as means for sustainable peace- and democracy-building, and to contribute to cooperation and understanding processes within South Eastern Europe and Europe in general and to the integration of the countries of the former Yugoslavia into a shared European civil society and memory space.

Specific aims of the study trip and workshop 2013 :

- To explore the topic of conflicting memories in Germany (Third Reich/GDR, victims /perpetrators, victims/victims, Poland/Germany, FRG/GDR) and the challenges of memorialization linked to these conflicting memories
- To connect the experiences from Germany with the situations and remembrance work in the countries of the former Yugoslavia and in the other represented countries
- To deepen contacts and cooperation and to provide a space to develop future activities between the participants of the platform

## **3. Preparation**

In January 2013 we organized a meeting in Berlin in order to work on the future development of the platform in general and to prepare the study visit and workshop in Germany in October 2013. The decision to organize this fourth annual workshop and study trip in Germany had been taken during the previous workshop in France in October 2012. As we had been in Bosnia and Herzegovina and Croatia in 2010 and 2011, and in France in 2012, it seemed appropriated and logical to continue our trans-European exploration in Germany, and several

of our partners, the Institute for Applied History in Frankfurt/Oder, the Berlin Wall Memorial and the Ravensbrück Memorial had notified their interest and will to get actively involved in the organization.

During this meeting, we also decided to rename our platform. Until now the platform was called “Dealing with difficult pasts in Western Europe and the Western Balkans – Transeuropean exchange platform”. We chose as new name “Memory Lab”, with the subtitle “Trans-European Exchange Platform on History and Remembrance”. We also decided to develop, until the end of the year, a website which will present the platform, its activities and the participating persons and organizations and through which we will increase the visibility of Memory Lab.

For the preparation of the program of the fourth annual study trip and workshop, we first took into account the evaluations of 2012. As the general feedback had been very positive, we decided to keep the main structure in the form of a two-days-study trip followed by a three-days-workshop. In the same time, on the basis of the previous experiences, we decided to include some time of reflection already during the study trip and also to try to make the general program a bit less dense. We decided also to experience a new approach for the workshop: Instead to organize overview-lectures about the memory-situation of the country at the beginning of the workshop as we had done in the years before, we chose this time a more inductive approach: The participants should first experience, by different means, the memory site where we would stay, and then from the impressions and experiences of this exploration and the one from the study trip, we would develop together general conclusions about the situation in the visited country.

Concerning the sites of our study trip and workshop, we wanted to propose to the participants a certain diversity which would allow them to explore different layers of German history and different approaches of memorialization in Germany. We decided not to put the focus on Berlin, as Berlin is the most visited spot in Germany in general, also when it comes to study trips about memorialization. We wanted to give the participants the opportunity to explore also towns and sites which are not so known and which they will have less occasions to discover during a normal trip. We decided to organize the three-days-workshop in Ravensbrück, mainly for three reasons: 1) The site of Ravensbrück, which was the biggest women’s concentration camp during the Third Reich, is less known than other former concentration camps as Buchenwald or Dachau. 2) The Ravensbrück Memorial proposes a very rich set of different exhibitions and memorialization approaches, and is one of the rare Memorials in Germany which specifically explores the topic of perpetrators. The site has also gone through different transformations from the Third Reich through the GDR until today. 3) The accommodation is part of the Memorial site – the Youth Hostel Ravensbrück is situated in the renovated houses of the former SS-guards -, what presents an unique possibility to experience and explore in depth such a site and in the same time to reflect the challenges linked to such a situation. - Staying for the workshop in Ravensbrück, we decided to split the study trip between Berlin and Frankfurt/Oder and Slubice. For Berlin, we decided to put a specific focus on sites linked to the history of the GDR, and, concerning the Third Reich, we chose with the Rosenthaler Strasse 39 a site which is less known than the big Memorials of Berlin. We also opted for Frankfurt/Oder and Slubice, on the one hand because this place

appears as not so spectacular concerning memorialization as sites like Ravensbrück or Berlin, and on the other hand because of its situation on the German-Polish border in order to explore the possibilities and difficulties of cross-border cooperation related to memory-topics.

Around the visits, explorations and discussions on memorialization, we decided also to include in the program several “institutional“ moments dedicated to the development of Memory Lab:

- A reception in Berlin to which we would invite different organizations from Berlin in order to allow exchange and networking and to make Memory Lab more known.
- A discussion within the group in Ravensbrück about the future evolution of Memory Lab
- A time in Ravensbrück as opportunity for the participants to discuss and develop common activities and projects for the future

## **4. Implementation**

### **4.1. Project content and development**

The participants arrived the 20<sup>th</sup> October in **Berlin**, and we could start as planned our official program of visits in the morning of the 21<sup>th</sup> October. We first went to the Berlin-Hohenschönhausen Memorial, established in the former Stasi prison, where our group was guided by two former detainees. We then went to the Rosenthaler-Strasse 39 in Berlin-Mitte, where different memory sites and institutions are gathered: We visited the Anne Frank Centar, where the group was received by Veronika Nahm who presented the activities of the Centar especially in the educational field, and then went to the Museum “Otto Weidt Workshop for the Blind” dedicated to Otto Weidt who helped persecuted Jews during the National Socialist dictatorship. We then went to the Berlin Wall Memorial in Bernauer Strasse, where Gunter Schlusche, architect in chief of the Memorial, guided the group through different parts of the open-air Memorial. After the visit, the group gathered in the Documentation Centar of the Museum, in order to discuss with Günter Schlusche the questions which had been provoked by the visit.

The first day ended with a reception in the French-German Youth Office, to which Memory Lab had invited persons from different organizations in Berlin dealing with memory work and/or South Eastern Europe. Welcome words by Dr. Markus Ingenlath, General Secretary of the FGYO, and Alma Masic, director of the YIHR BiH, were followed by a power-point-presentation about Memory Lab with examples of activities from the last years, and after this the guests and the participants of group gathered in an informal way around a buffet. Persons representing the following had been invited and participated at the reception: Berghof Foundation, SWP, Robert Bosch Foundation, GIZ, Friedrich-Ebert-Foundation, Heinrich-Böll-Foundation, German Historical Museum, Traduki, Goethe Institut, German Foreign Office, University Halle, Deutsche Welle, Genshagen Foundation.

*For the list of names of the guests, see annex 3.*

The next day, October, 22, we went by bus to **Frankfurt/Oder**. In the Viadrina- University, the historian Jan Musekamp gave us an overview about the history of Frankfurt/Oder and **Slubice** in the context of the German-Polish relations. We then had a guided visit of the center of Frankfurt/Oder, with Juliane Tomann and Jacqueline Niesser from the Institute for Applied History, which ended in Slubice, on the Polish side of the river Oder. In the afternoon, three thematic explorations were proposed, guided by persons from the Institute for Applied History :

1. The Jewish heritage in Frankfurt/Oder and Slubice.
2. Cultural cooperation between Frankfurt/Oder and Slubice.
3. Education and History in Frankfurt/Oder and Slubice,

Originally, a fourth group had been foreseen, on the topic “The Communist heritage of Frankfurt/Oder and Slubice”, but the guide had to cancel because of health issues. After the parallel explorations, the three groups gathered again in order to present and discuss the results of the explorations within a plenary session in the “Collegium Polonicum” in Slubice.

In the evening, we drove by bus from Frankfurt/Oder to the Memorial Site of **Ravensbrück** where we stayed and were also accommodated for the next three days. The workshop in Ravensbrück started the 23<sup>rd</sup> October with a general presentation of the Ravensbrück Memorial by Dr. Matthias Heyl, head of the Educational Services. Then started the exploration of the Memorial site, which took place in several steps: First, the participants were invited to discover different parts of the Memorial Site individually or in small groups, but without a guide. In a second step, employees of the Memorial joined the participants in order to answer their questions and give additional explanations. In a third step, the group went to the former *Kommandantur*-building where a new permanent exhibition had been recently opened: There, Matthias Heyl first gave a general overview about the exhibition, and then invited the participants to discover the exhibition by their own, and, while doing so, to reflect the question “With which groups represented in this exhibition can I identify myself?”. Finally, the participants gathered in different small groups to discuss the question of the personal identification in relation with the different social and national groups represented in the exhibition. The first day ended with the screening of the documentary movie “What remains”: The film tells the story of two women, one was a detainee in Ravensbrück and the other a SS-guard there, and shows how their families are today coping with this legacy.

We started the second day of the workshop by collecting topics in relation with what the participants had discovered the previous day in the Memorial site and which they would like to deepen in working groups. Three main topics emerged which were then discussed in parallel working groups:

- Educational and methodological approaches, with three specific topics: How to articulate the relation between esthetics and horror? How to apply the “do not harm”-principle in memory work? How to link memory and present?
- The representation of perpetrators in memory sites and the relation between memory sites and their surrounding
- How to deal with changes of political systems? What influence do they have on the evolution of memory sites and memory work?

Each of these groups discussed their topic along the following three questions: What challenges does this topic present to memorialization processes? Related to this topic, how is the situation in our different countries? From what we see in Ravensbrück: what is transferable to our countries? At the end of the morning, the groups gathered again in plenary and presented the results of their discussions.

Originally, we had planned to continue this discussion in the afternoon, but we decided to modify the program, on the one hand because many participants had said that they didn't have the time to discover all parts of the Memorial site the previous day, and on the other hand because we realized that we needed a more formal opportunity to mingle more the new and the "old" participants. Therefore, in the beginning of the afternoon, we first organized an interactive exercise where participants presented each other their biography and work. After this, Matthias Heyl guided the group to the parts of the site which most of the persons hadn't explored yet: the former part of the camp which had been used by Siemens for slave labor and which is currently not open to the public, and also the two exhibitions about the female SS-guards and the male SS-officers which are placed in two former living houses of the SS-guards. At the end of the afternoon, we continued the program as it had been originally foreseen: Given the fact that we were now since two days not only visiting, but living in former concentration camp, we gave the participants the opportunity to exchange and discuss, in small groups, about this unusual experience.

The third day of the workshop, the 25<sup>th</sup> October, was in a first step the opportunity to draw conclusions from all what we had seen in Berlin, Frankfurt/Oder-Slubice and Ravensbrück and to compare it with the situation in other countries represented in the group. Therefore, in parallel working groups, the participants discussed the following two questions: What is specific to Germany regarding memorialization processes? And what are similarities and differences with our other countries? After this, we gathered again in plenary and the working groups presented the results of their discussions. – The last working day was also the opportunity to switch to a more institutional discussion about "Memory Lab" and its future evolution: We especially presented and discussed the idea and structure of the planned "Memory lab"-website, and also talked about the organization of the workshop and study trip in 2014: As we had been now two years in Western/Central Europe, we decided that we would move back to South Eastern Europe, and chose Kosovo and Macedonia for next year, also because the monumental and controversial project "Skopje 2014" will be completed next year. We then gave the participants the possibility to gather in small groups in order to discuss about projects and activities they would like to develop and implement in the future. Four parallel groups worked on the following projects:

- A French-German-Croatian-Bosnian exchange project with history teachers from the four countries on the topic "How to teach wars in schools"?, to be started in 2014, in the framework of the 100<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the beginning of the First World war
- "Memory Lab Junior": a project with visits of memory sites gathering high school students from Bosnia and Herzegovina, Serbia, France and Germany, to be started in 2014



- One group worked on the project “Developing a culture of communication about memory in Prijedor”, with a workshop to be implemented in Prijedor until the end of 2013
- One group worked on the implementation of the “Memory Lab”-website, which should be achieved until end of 2013 / beginning of 2014

The working program ended with a written evaluation of the week by the participants.

## **4.2. Methods**

It was very important to us to use a diversity of methods during our study trip and workshop.

The following methods were used:

- Field visits with local curators and witnesses
- Individual exploration of sites, followed by discussion with curators
- Inputs from experts
- Plenary sessions and discussions
- Working groups
- Film screening
- Interactive exercises
- Written evaluations

As the previous years, we had decided to use not only English but also Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian as official language during our study trip and workshop, with simultaneous translation (during the plenary sessions) or consecutive translation (for example during the field visits). We had decided this because there are many very committed and interesting NGO-activists in the Balkans who don't speak English and who are therefore often excluded from international conferences where only English is proposed as official language. During the visits, some of the presentations were made in German language, which we translated then into English and BCS.

## **4.3. Participants**

All in all, we have been a group of 41 participants, including the team and the main interpreter. Concerning the profile of the participants, the most important criteria was that the persons have a concrete link with memory sites and dealing-with-the-past-questions, for example through their work in Memorials, Historical Museums, NGOs or victim associations. From the 41 persons, 10 participated for the first time. From the others, 11 had already participated at one of the previous workshops, 9 at two previous workshops, and 11 persons at all the three previous workshops. These numbers show a high continuity within the group but also that every year new persons are joining and enriching the group.

The participants are living in the following countries: 8 in Germany, 4 in France, one in Belgium, one in the Netherlands, one in Poland, 13 in Bosnia and Herzegovina, 5 in Croatia, 6 in Serbia and 2 in Kosovo. All together, nine countries were represented this year, and it was the first year that a person from Poland took part, from the Auschwitz State Memorial.

In a gender perspective, from the 41 participants 23 were women and 18 men.

*For the list with the names of the participants and their institutional affiliation, see Annex 2.*

## 5. Evaluation by the participants

On the basis of the evaluations written by the participants at the end of the workshop in Ravenbrück, the main results of the study trip and the workshop 2013 can be summarized as following<sup>1</sup> :

1. The overall program received a very positive feedback, as appears for example in the following quotations: *“The study trip and the workshop were very well organised. We had the opportunity to explore different periods, with different media (lectures, visits, self exploration...) and various persons.”* *“In my opinion the study tour organisation and implementation was great. Selection of locations and raised topics really enable wide overview of all issues related to memorialisation culture in Germany and opened many learning possibilities, and also for better understanding of cultures and memory policies on the Balkans.”* Among the points which were especially emphasized are the diversity of approaches (*“well balanced in sense of learning , experiencing, self-exploring, self-reflecting and exchanging –there was enough space for all of it”*), the choice of the places (*“interesting was the diversity of visited historical places and to chose them from different periods (GDR-history, NS-history)”*), the structure and content of the program (*“Share between study visits and workshops was well balanced”*, *“Topics selected for workshop discussions were very interesting, discussions were fruitful”*) and the quality of the organization (*“very good”*, *“well organized”*, *“fantastic”*). Positively was also highlighted also that the program had been modified the second day of the workshop (*“I appreciate very much that the program was changed on Thursday”*; *“The organisation was perfect, and also very good was the flexibility to change the programme in the afternoon of the second day in Ravensbruck”*). Individual critical voices concern the time management of the day in Berlin and the realization of some activities, for example the working groups in Frankfurt/Oder-Slubice.
2. In comparison to the previous years, some underline that the good quality of the program has been perpetuated: *“Alike the previous workshops, organisation this year was at the high level”*. *“The important fact is that after four years the high level of quality is still maintained.”* Several persons also emphasize the progress in comparison to previous years: *“The organisation was much better than the previous year when the schedule was overloaded”*. *“Workshops were well organised too; with more specific questions and results than previous years.”* *“As every year, I found out that study trip/workshop is improving in all above-mentioned points (content, structure, organisation)”*. The fact that during the workshop we insisted on self-exploration in order to discover the site was very much appreciated by some, while others regretted that we met less experts and survivors than in the previous years. In any case, the efforts to do every year something different seems to be appreciated:

---

<sup>1</sup> The complete answers of the evaluations have been gathered in a separate document.

*“New and different contents in comparison to the previous year make Memory Lab annual meetings vital and vibrant.”*

3. The stay in Ravensbrück left a particular strong impression on the group. Most of the participants discovered Ravensbrück and were struck by the history of the concentration camp and the richness and diversity of the Memorial site. *“The entire place of Ravensbrück is a story for itself. I did not know about this place before, and that it was mainly female Prison/Camp. Also I did not know about the role of Siemens in forced labour. Everything about this place is “interesting” (very bad use of word), and educative and it leaves very strong impression on me”*. As particularly instructive and inspiring were seen the exhibitions about perpetrators (see also below point 11), and also the fact that parts of the old exhibition from the GDR-times had been conserved (*“Ravensbrück shows that it is possible to preserve/keep commemorative practices/memories from past regimes, and present them together with modern commemorative practices i.e. that dialogue between different modes of memorialisation is possible at one location.”*) The quality of the pedagogical team of the Memorial and its director Matthias Heyl was also highlighted : *“The atmosphere created by the memorial site and the welcoming team was full of sensitivity, humour and „bienveillance“. I very much appreciated that.”*
  
4. To the profound impression created by Ravensbrück contributed also the fact that we stayed there all the three days of the workshop and that the accommodation is integrated in the Memorial site, in the houses of the former female SS-guards. The fact to stay several days and to be accommodated there provoked strong reactions. On the one hand it was very much appreciated to be in this way able to explore in depth the site: *“3 days in Ravensbrück – total privilege and chance for in-depth investigation of the site.” “It was good to have enough time to study and discover the Memorial of Ravensbrück” “In-depth information-knowledge and understanding of the place of the concentration camp. Being at the site like Ravensbrück gives a special feeling.” “I learned I can stay 3 full days in Ravensbrück and I liked this experience. The place is dedicated to memory, history and educational work and it is a great tool.”* Others insisted on the difficulty of this experience: *“Spending 4 nights in Ravensbrück seems too much. I realize the importance but to me personally it was hard spending time here knowing the history of the place.” “Three days of stay at a former concentration camp side is an awful long time. Although I was here voluntarily, although I learnt a lot, although I have been with a fantastic group of people, although I have never lived through detention and war.” “I was disturbed with the stay and accommodation in concentration camp compound. For the persons of my war experience this was bit difficult experience!”* But in the same time this discomfort is seen as an integral part in dealing with such difficult issues as wars and mass murder, and helps to stimulate processes of confrontation with the past and the reflection about it and the own involvement. *“The most moving and disturbing for me was the stay in Ravensbrück. Somehow it connects the past with the present, and gives a life experience on the dealing with difficult past.” “It was discomfoting to spent time at the site where Nazi*

*ideology was so bluntly and visually manifested. Also, it was creepy to know that we were sleeping and eating where perpetrators did the same – it imposes imaginary correlation with perpetrators, which causes great discomfort.” “The fact that we stayed in a youth hostel which has been established in the former houses of the SS-guards, together with the contrast between the beautiful landscape and weather and the horror of the past, created the necessary disturbances for going deeper in the reflexion on what we are talking about, what we are seeing and what we are doing.” “To sleep in the houses of former SS camp guards and wake up near the campsite became more emotionally disturbing day by day – the more I learned about this site, the more I felt uncomfortable. At the same time I experienced how I gained better understanding of the complexity of the history and the current function as a memorial. It made me realize that exactly this disturbance (what was a bit missing from the main exhibition) is maybe necessary for deep reflection, especially on perpetrator issues. I am still struggling how this could be transformed in a method of educational value (without disrespecting the suffering and the stories of the victims) but it provided a lot of food for thought.”* It was necessary to have time in the program in order to talk in small groups about this unusual experience, what allowed very personal exchanges: *“The discussion in our small group about the question how it is to live and work for a few days on the site of a former concentration camp: a great atmosphere of open and personal telling and listening.”*

5. Concerning the visit in Frankfurt/Oder and Slubice, many highlighted as main impression the contrast of the situation there with Berlin. *“It was striking to come to Frankfurt/Oder after being in Berlin: the impression of being suddenly in a “memory-desert”, with very few visible traces of memorialization - after being in Berlin where you have the impression to run into a monument all 100 meters.” “Frankfurt Oder/Slubice gave an idea that not everything is that elaborated in “Commemorative culture“ in Germany.”* The visit also allowed to raise awareness about the state of German-Polish relations and the difficulties to confront the past within this relationship: *“The discovery of crossborder cooperation in Frankfurt Oder/Slubice and better to say of the many points the cooperation is missing! This leads to important questions on the German-Polish relationship” “The third important thing for me is notion that Germany and Poland have still to go long way to achieve the level of relations between Germany and France” “Another thing that was amazing is the reconciliation example of Frankfurt/Oder – Slubice, and how actually many things are to be yet resolved and confronted.”*
6. Concerning the two sites we visited in Berlin related to the history of the GDR, the Hohenschönhausen- Memorial and the Berlin Wall Memorial, many were irritated by the way the guided visit in the former Stasi-prison in Hohenschönhausen was done by former detainees (*“I was quite disturbed with the guide in the STASI prison, who obviously had a problem with mixing of his personal feelings with historical events and facts”*; *“guided tour in Hohenschönhausen was disturbing because of the confusion between history & memory”*), and this raised many discussions about the

role of victims and witnesses in Memorials and memorialization processes (see also below point 12). Concerning the Berlin Wall Memorial, several persons underlined its open-air-concept as very stimulating. Both visits together raised critical questions about the treatment of GDR history in Germany's memory culture. (*"There is a dominating 'West-German' perspective on history concerning DDR"*).

7. Concerning the memory sites in the Rosenthaler Strasse, the visit of the Anne Frank Center was appreciated especially because of its focus on educational activities: *"Anne Frank Zentrum – excellent guide -curator, excellent small educational centre, good ideas that can be used in work with children"*; *"Anne Frank museum in particular, where we had a chance to see very concretely and right on the spot how educational activities have been carried out, which was my primary interest."* The visit of the Museum "Otto Weidt Workshop for the Blind" allowed to discover a topic which is usually not so much talked about in Memorials and museums. (*"The Otto-Weidt-workshop for the blind: not only that rescuers get an own memorial, but also that rescue is not represented in an idealized-romanticized way: that is it talked about successful but also failed rescues, that Otto Weidt was not alone in helping the Jews, that the Jews were not passive but actively taking part in their hiding."*)
8. The visits and discussions gave many participants a more differentiated view of Germany's memory culture and of its complexity, and helped to correct an often idealized perception of Germany in this regard. (*"An important issue for me was cracking of own prejudice on ideal situation in context of a memory culture in Germany. As the system in Germany is far more advanced than the system in Croatia, I understood that even here there are obstacles, difficulties and dilemmas around dealing with the GDR heritage within today's' Germany"*; *"German experience in dealing with the past is more complex than one would expect. Divisions between East and West Germany, and one-sided narrative are present."*; *"Since I believed that Germany has reached a high level in area of memorialisation culture and dealing with the past it was extremely interesting and surprising to find out about so many issues and problems still to be resolved, especially when it comes to issue of GDR."*) The combination of the different visits was seen as excellent way to illustrate the diversity and complexity within Germany's memory culture. (*"The combination of visiting Berlin as a kind of memory hub, then Frankfurt-Slubice as memory desert and finally Ravensbruck as a memory labyrinth was well conceptualized. What is going on in Berlin is in no way representative for memory culture in Germany."*)
9. Discovering the complexities and difficulties of Germany's memory culture led several participants from South Eastern Europe to develop other views about the situation in their own countries. (*"German examples of dealing with difficult past indicate that the Balkans is not delayed in the process"*; *"I learned that in spite of everything: We were not, one to another, the cruellest in the wars we had. In spite of everything we are not the slowest ones in implementation of reconciliation and memorialisation processes. We have the most complicated situation in the history of*

*post conflicting communities*”; “We, from former Yugoslavia need to calm down a little bit and to stop to push ourselves and our society with huge expectations. We can learn a lot from Germany, but we should not apply the models that have not arisen from our experience and our needs.”). If several persons expressed their scepticism about using the word “model” for Germany’s memory culture, many nevertheless insist how inspiring the confrontation with the German experiences is (“I am sure this was very useful for all of us coming from Bosnia. I would like for everyone dealing with memorialisation in our country to get the same experience.” See also below, point 13). But confronting different experiences can also lead to too easy comparisons and equalizations, an issue which needs to be more addressed. (“Only occasionally expressed notion that equalisation of crime/perpetrators (SS officers vs. Serbian officers) and sufferings (Srebrenica – Auschwitz) is problematic. This needs to be discussed more because Holocaust in the Western Balkans is instrumentalised by everyone.”)

10. While several participants from South Eastern Europe said that this confrontation with Germany made them see their own situation differently, several participants from Western/Central Europe also insisted that, despite being in Germany, through the contact with the persons from the Western Balkans and the discussions comparing experiences from Germany and those of other countries, they learned a lot about South Eastern Europe. (“I got a lot of information about the situations in different countries of Yugoslavia”, “Even if we were in Germany, I still learned a lot about the different situations in the Balkans from the participants from this area” ; “I learned so much about “dealing with history” in Bosnia, Croatia and Serbia and what it really means that it is still the present there not the past... This led really to reflection about the different situation in 2014 concerning Western Balkans and Western Europe.”) The workshop illustrated once more that this kind of exchange is not just useful for one side, but for all participating sides, and that the learning processes between South Eastern Europe and Western/Central Europe are reciprocal. (“Being surrounded by experts from the Western Balkans definitely sharpened and enriched my thoughts on how to proceed with the work I do and want to do in the future”)
11. The question of the perpetrators and of their possible memorialization was one of the most discussed topics and a topic which triggered a particular interest among many participants. (“Facing the perpetrators issue was the most striking experience for me; I have not thought of it that much before. It is good that it is addressed at the Ravensbrück Memorial and well developed/displayed/explained”; “discussion about perpetrators and bystanders was also very useful because it brought me new perspective that I didn’t dedicated much thought to before”; “What was the most interesting thing to learn is the role of perpetrators, especially women, in concentration camps”). Dealing with the question of perpetrators is a very sensitive and difficult issue, and the way it is done in the Ravensbrück Memorial attracted positive attention. (“One interesting thing I learned is the way perpetrators are presented in Ravensbrück; in an analytical-critical and not a judgemental and/or

*demonizing way. If we take seriously the task of prevention, then it is not enough to focus only on the victims but it is also necessary to understand how perpetrators became perpetrators”). In the same time the question appeared whether a focus on perpetrators is possible and appropriate when, like in the countries of the former Yugoslavia, the suffering of the victims has not been recognized yet. (“Can war criminals, their families be publicly discussed/ include their biographies in memorialisation processes if victims, their sufferings and rights are not recognised? This issue was raised on number of occasions and I deem it very important.”)*

12. Another topic which was very much discussed, especially in relation with the visit of the former Stasi-prison in Hohenschönhausen, was the possible role of victims and witnesses in memorialization processes, and also to what extent this role can be problematic. (*“I learned a lot about the importance of eye-witnesses and subjectivity in the educational process on the one hand, but also about the problem of lacking expertise on the other hand”; “Through the visit of the Stasi-prison I have seen the possible advantages and problems if guided tours are made by former inmates (or victims in general), and also the different ways these guides are dealing with “their” past.”; “Opening of space for victims and witness is definitely a priority. However, one should keep in mind that witness statements by themselves do not necessarily mean a benefit for the society. Multi- layer approach needs to be applied in these processes.”)* All together, the visits and discussions focused the attention on the necessity to develop differentiated and multi-layered approaches in the field of memory work. (*“One thing that I learned is that Memorials cannot be based exclusively on statements of survivors, or on research work of scientists only, but combination of the approaches”; “Presentation of a wider context and different perspectives of a historical moment (perpetrators, victims, bystanders) is the only right/good approach in dealing with such issues.”)*
13. Many underlined that what they had seen, heard, experienced and discussed was very inspiring and gave concrete ideas which would be useful for their own work at home. (*“In Frankfurt and Slubice I learnt that nothing relevant would happen unless there are specific and efficient efforts directed towards bringing people closer, and that knowledge I will put in use in Prijedor, the city I am coming from.”; “Being “a curator of nonexistent memorials”, as I call myself, I am definitely going to use each moment of Ravensbrück experience in my work. I was particularly impressed by the concept, but with aesthetics and materials used for the exhibitions, which I am definitely going to apply in Čarakovo memorial centre that is currently under the construction.”; “For my work the most useful was visit to Hohenschonhausen prison where we were guided by ex-detainee and where we heard his experience and impressions about events from the prison. I think this was not good example of guiding in the memorial centre, and I will try to advocate engagement of professional and trained staff in my organisation, and to provide objective overview of events.”; “I could use different methods that I saw employed by different organizations especially ones used in educational purposes. Also I get good base for further research of related*

topics.”; *“Lots of information I received during this week I can use in my work. I found particularly interesting comments and opinions of the workshop participants, as during the discussions we often drew a parallel between learned and new information, and applicability thereof in context of everyday’s political problems that surround us.”*)

14. Concerning the group itself, several underlined the advantage of having a high level of continuity among the persons participating in the annual study trips and workshops. (*“This year, as we got to know each other and we already had many discussions over the years, I think we saved a precious time.”*; *“As group, we have become more coherent, already working on joint projects, as outcome of ‘Memory Lab’.*”) In the same time it is underlined as a positive point that the group is not static and that new persons got involved. (*“It is important that new people dealing with different aspects of memorialisation joined the group”*; *“It is also interesting that the group is in evolution, with new participants so the team made efforts (list with photos, badge names ...) in order we could know all the participants.”*) The atmosphere in the group is often stretched as positive (*“Excellent was the atmosphere and the working together in our group. Discussions were nearly always fully interesting!”*), but that does not exclude difficult discussions and the difficulty to talk about certain topics. (*“It was confirmed to me that even amongst us who are open for discussions and dialogue about dealing with the past there are taboo topics, that our wounds are still deep and that there are narratives that need to be pushed aside, either to avoid insulting of victims or questioning of established war narratives.”*) The personal contact between the participants and the “confrontation” of different biographies within the group is seen as very enriching. (*“The most important things that remains from this study trip, is learning about the different biographies and experiences of the group members, this really made me (re)think certain topics.”*; *“One of the most interesting things I learned this week: To be with survivors, who are of my age”*). The personal contacts are also the basis for future common activities which several persons plan or hope to realize. (*“First of all I enjoy contact with a few people from different institutions or organisations which could give us a profit in future, in a various form of cooperation”*; *“The conversations I had with other participants will hopefully lead to cooperation. I don’t know exactly how and when, it’s pretty vague, but I would really love to realize some of the ideas we talked about.”*; *“The highlight of this study trip/workshop is idea/concept of organizing of exchange programs for young people.”*)

## **6. Suggestions for future study trips and workshops**

In the written evaluations, we asked the participants to express suggestions for future study trips and workshops. We can see suggestions in three fields: the organization of the program; the content of the program; and possible places for future study trips and workshops.



Related to the organization of the program, there are different suggestions which concern:

- the time management (6x): *“more time for visits”, “more time in each site during the next study trip”, “shorter working day”, “more time for plenary discussions”, “more free time between the visits”, “one afternoon of free time”*
- the length of the program and the balance between the workshop and the study trip (4x): *“to extend the workshop and the study trip”, “three days workshop too long”, “three days of visit, and two days of workshop”, “introduce a more explicit moment of group work/ reflection already during the study trip”*
- questions linked to the accommodation (3x): *to avoid accommodation so close or in former concentration camp: 2 x ; “improve wifi-access”*
- the place of certain activities (12x): *“more excercises to make acquaintance in order to facilitate the mingling of participants a bit more”; “starting to collect ideas for joint activities before last day”, “more inputs by lectures of academics”; “more historical background information on the sites”; “to work bit more concretely ; some joint and “visible” work/product after the discussions, to have specific suggestions and proposals for concrete steps”; “to have an introductory session prior to study trip”, “to offer a buffet for the first evening diner to be more time flexible” ; “to chose more carefully tour guides” ; “to bring a guitar and song books”; “to present the actual situation in Prijedor”; “more dialogue about future activities”; “to print every day a kind of journal which could be a summary of the day from different points of view”*
- organisations to be invited (1x): *“inviting some more French institutions”*
- the output of the study trip and workshop (3x): *“produce a written and photo documentation” / “a report about what we saw and discussed” / “a journal or publication with our thoughts and reasoning”*

Concerning possible topics for future study trips and workshops, the following suggestions were made:

- Educational approaches and programs: 3x
- The role of media
- World War 2 memorials and museums
- Gender /women
- Bystanders
- Family narratives
- Relations between Poles, Jews and Germans, relations between Poles, Lithuanians and Ukrainians

Concerning possible places where future study trips and workshops could take place, the following suggestions were made:

- Croatia: Zadar and surroundings with traumatic sites linked to WW2, socialist Yugoslavia and 1991-95
- Russia: 2x
- Auschwitz: 2x
- Former Soviet Republics
- South of Balkans
- Spain
- Spain/ Catalonia/ Basque countries
- Serbia
- Serbia (Vojvodina) / Hungary
- Israel / Palestine

- Germany: Dachau, Bergen-Belsen
- Poland: 3x
- Poland / Ukraine
- Belgium/Netherlands
- Ukraine/ Russia

## 7. Conclusions and future perspectives

The main results of the fourth edition of the annual study trip and workshop of Memory Lab can be summarized as following:

- o Increased knowledge among the participants about memory sites, memorialization processes and different memories in Germany and other European countries, and increased awareness about similarities and differences between Germany and other countries
- o Increased knowledge and concrete incentives among the participants how to deal in a practical way, in Memorials and in the educational field, with challenges linked to difficult, different and conflicting memories
- o The planning of several joint projects and activities by participants of the platform
- o The development and deepening of contacts between the participants
- o The strengthening of the common platform “Memory Lab” as a space of sustainable communication, mutual learning, networking and cooperation between the involved organizations and with other initiatives

The developing and strengthening of Memory Lab is a gradual process and therefore needs a permanent effort. Beginning of 2014 will be finished the website of “Memory Lab” ([www.memorylab-europe.eu](http://www.memorylab-europe.eu)), which will present the platform, its activities and the participating persons and organizations and which will be an important step to increase the visibility of Memory Lab.

After Bosnia and Herzegovina and Croatia in 2010 and 2011, France in 2012 and Germany 2013, Memory Lab will move back to the Western Balkans in 2014, more precisely to Kosovo and Macedonia, as has been decided during the workshop in Ravensbrück. This choice will allow on the one hand to strengthen the place of Kosovo within Memory Lab, and on the other to introduce colleagues from Macedonia, which is not yet part of Memory Lab. The scheduled dates are 5 – 11 October 2014.

The preparation meeting for the study trip and workshop 2014 is foreseen to take place in Skopje in March 2014. During this meeting, the coordination team, together with partners from Kosovo and Macedonia, will decide about the structure, the content and the organization of the program for October 2014.

Also, during 2014, the coordination team will continue to be in active contact and exchange with the different partners of Memory Lab and especially follow the joint activities which are developed and realized by several of them.

After the study trip and workshop 2014, the coordination team foresees to realize a comprehensive evaluation of the effects which have been reached in the first five years of the platform, as a basis for the further development of the platform.

## Annex 1: Program

### Sunday October 20:

Arrival of the participants in Berlin

Accommodation in Berlin (20-22th October):

*Hotel A&O Berlin Mitte*

*Köpenicker Str. 127-129, 10179 Berlin, T: +49 30 80 94 7 - 52 00*

*<http://www.aohostels.com/en/berlin/berlin-mitte/>*

19h00 : Meeting in the hotel: Welcome / Presentation of the program and of the participants

20h15: Welcome dinner in Restaurant “Kuchenkaiser”, Am Oranienplatz 11-13, Berlin - Kreuzberg

### **Study trip: Berlin and Frankfurt / Oder - Slubice**

#### Monday October 21:

##### Berlin and its remembrance-challenges between the Third Reich and the GDR

Breakfast

8h15: Meeting in the hotel lobby

9h-10h45: Visit of the Memorial Hohenschönhausen

11h30 – 13h: Visit of the Memorial Site Rosenthaler Strasse 39: Memorial “Silent Heroes” (Stille Helden), Museum “Otto Weidt Workshop for the Blind”, and Anne-Frank-Center.

Introduction by Veronika Nahm from the Anne-Frank-Center.

13h: Lunch

14h30- 17h30: Visit of the Memorial Berliner Mauer, with Günter Schlusche, followed by discussion on the visits and experiences of the day

18h15: Reception at the French-German Youth Office (DFJW, Molkenmarkt 1, 10179 Berlin): Welcome by Dr. Markus Ingenlath, General Secretary of the DFJW, presentation of “Memory Lab” and meeting with representatives of organisations dealing with memory work and South Eastern Europe. – Buffet dinner.

#### Tuesday October 22:

##### Frankfurt/Oder and Slubice and the challenges of crossborder-memories

Breakfast / Checkout of our hotel in Berlin

8h30: Departure by bus to Frankfurt/Oder

11h: Introduction into the history of Frankfurt – Oder and Slubice and the German-Polish relations on the spot: Dr. Jan Musekamp, Historian, European University Frankfurt/Oder

11h45: How history has shaped the landscape of a town: Joint visit of Frankfurt/Oder and Slubice, with Jacqueline Niesser and Juliane Tomann, Institute for Applied History

Frankfurt/Oder

13h: Lunch

14h15-16h30: A transborder history? Exploration in small groups of German and Polish memory sites in Frankfurt and Slubice

17h-18h: Reflection and discussion on the visits and experiences of the day

18h15: Diner

19h30: Departure by bus to Ravensbrück

21h30: Arrival at the International Youth Centre of Ravensbrück

Accommodation in Ravensbrück (22-26 October):

*Youth Hostel Ravensbrück, Straße der Nationen 3, D - 16798 Fürstenberg/Havel, T/*

*+49 33093 60590, <http://www.jh-ravensbrueck.de/>*

## **Workshop in Ravensbrück**

### Wednesday October 23:

Discovering the Ravensbrück Memorial Site and reflecting the question of Identities

Breakfast (until 8h45)

9h: Welcome to the workshop / Introduction to the Memorial Site of Ravensbrück by Matthias Heyl, Head of the Educational Services of the Memorial

10h30: Self-guided exploration of the Site

11h30: Questions related to the exploration of the site

12h45: Lunch

14h45: Exercise “With which groups represented in the Memorial can I identify myself?”

15h45: Group work on the question of identities and (re)presentation of social and national groups in the Ravensbrück Memorial Site

18h30: Diner

20h: Screening of the documentary film “Was bleibt”

### Thursday October 24: Deepening the topics

Breakfast (until 8h45)

9h: From what we have seen and heard the day before in Ravensbrück: Identification of topics to be deepened in parallel groups, with three leading questions:

1. What challenges do these topics present to memorialization processes?
2. Related to this topic, how is the situation in our different countries?
3. From what we see in Ravensbrück: what is transferable to our countries?

Parallel Working groups

12h30: Lunch

14h30-16h45: Continuation of the work in parallel groups, and presentation and discussion of the results in plenary

17h: Living and working on a site of a former concentration camp: Experiences and reflections. Common discussion

18h30: Diner

### Friday October 25: Reflecting the past, the present and the future

Breakfast (until 8h45)

9h15-11h15: Analysis of current memorialization processes and educational approaches in Berlin, Frankfurt/Oder and Ravensbrück: What is specific to Germany? What are similarities and differences with our other countries?

Working groups and discussion in plenary

11h30-12h30: From “Dealing with difficult pasts” to “Memory Lab”: What is new in our platform? How to continue?

12h45: Lunch

14h30 – 17h : Planning of future activities / parallel working groups

17h30-18h30: Evaluation of the week

19h30: Diner in Fürstenberg/Havel

Restaurant “Am Yachthafen”

<http://www.yachthafen-restaurant-fuerstenberg.de/>

### Saturday 26<sup>th</sup> October:

Breakfast / Checkout of the Youth Hostel Ravensbrück

7h15: Transfer by bus from Ravensbrück to Berlin Tegel Airport (arrival at 9 am) and then to Berlin Central Train Station (arrival at 10 am)

## Annex 2: Participants

<b>Name / Ime</b>	<b>Organization / Organizacija</b>	<b>Function / Pozicija</b>	<b>Town / Grad</b>
<b>Kristina Babić</b>	Agencija lokalne demokratije / Agency for local democracy Osijek	Koordinatorica Projekata / Project Coordinator	Osijek (HR)
<b>Tamara Banjeglav</b>	Documenta - Centar za suočavanje s prošlošću / Center for dealing with the past	Koordinatorica programa kulture sjećanja / Program coordinator Culture of Memory	Zagreb (HR)
<b>Julie Biro</b>	CCFD – Terre Solidaire	Desk za Istočnu Europu / Desk for Eastern Europe	Paris (F)
<b>Ervin Blažević</b>	Optimisti 2004 Kozarac	Predsjednik / President	Prijedor (BiH)
<b>Laura Boerhout</b>	Anne Frank House – International Department / Odjel za međunarodnu saradnju	Freelance historian / Historičar freelance	Amsterdam (NL)
<b>Stéphanie Boutaud</b>	Oradour Memory Center / Memorijalni centar Oradour	Head of the Educational Service / Voditeljica edukacijskog odjela	Oradour sur Glane (FR)
<b>Griet Brosens</b>	Belgium Nationals Institute for War veterans / Belgijski nacionalni institut za ratne veterane	Historian, in charge of educational remembrance-projects/ historičar, zadužen za edukacijske projekte na temu sjećanja	Brussels (B)
<b>Marija Čečen</b>	Fond B92 / Foundation B92	Direktorica / Director	Beograd (SRB)
<b>Djurđa Djukić</b>	Centar za praktičnu politiku/ Kuća ljudskih prava	Koordinatorica na projektima / Project coordinator	Beograd (SRB)
<b>Amir Djuliman</b>		Interpreter BCS – English/ Prevoditelj BHS-engleski	Sarajevo (BiH)
<b>Mirsad Duratović</b>	Udruženje logoraša „Prijedor 92“ / Association of Camp Inmates „Prijedor 92“	Predsjednik / President	Prijedor (BiH)
<b>Elmaze Gashi</b>	Alter Habitus – Institute for Culture and Social Studies/ Institut kulturnih i društvenih studija	Executive Director / Izvršni direktor/	Prishtina (Kosovo)
<b>Alain Gueraud</b>	DRJSCS du Limousin	CEPJ / Savjetnik za obrazovanje mladih	Limoges (F)
<b>Elma Hašimbegović</b>	Historijski muzej Bosne i Hercegovine / Historical museum of BiH	Direktorica / Director	Sarajevo (BiH)
<b>Dr. Matthias Heyl</b>	Ravensbrück Memorial / Ravensbrück Memorijalni centar	Head of the Educational Department / Voditelj edukacijskog odjela	Ravensbrück (D)
<b>Dragana Latinčić</b>	Muzej grada Beograda / Museum of the Town of Belgrade	Kustosica – stručna saradnica za rad sa publikom / Curator	Beograd (SRB)

<b>Ana Kršinić - Lozica</b>	Hrvatski muzej arhitekture / Croatian Museum of Architecture	Znanstvena novakinja / Research assistant	Zagreb (HR)
<b>Joachim König</b>	Memorial of Buchenwald / Buchenwald Memorijalni centar	Pedagogical department / Odjel za obrazovanje	Weimar-Buchenwald (D)
<b>Carine Leveque</b>	ONAC National office for war veterans and war victims/ Francuski nacionalni ured za ratne veterane i žrtve rata	Coordinator Memory and communication / Koordinatorica sjećanje i komunikacija	Montpellier (F)
<b>Birgit Manz</b>	Ravensbrück Memorial / Ravensbrück Memorijalni centar	Intern / Praktikant	Ravenbrück (D)
<b>Ružica Marjanović</b>	Festival“Na pola puta“ / Festival „Half way“	Programska urednica i osnivačica Festivala/ Programme editor and the Festival founder	Užice (SRB)
<b>Alma Mašić</b>	Youth Initiative for Human Rights BiH / Inicijativa mladih za ljudska prava BiH	Director / Direktorica	Sarajevo (BiH)
<b>Djordje Mihovilović</b>	J.U. Spomen područje / Memorial Site Jasenovac	Viši kustos / Senior curator	Jasenovac (HR)
<b>Sven Milekić</b>	Inicijativa mladih za ljudska prava Hrvatska / YIHR Croatia	Koordinator programa tranzicijske pravde / Coordinator program Transitional Justice	Zagreb (HR)
<b>Dragana Milutinović</b>	United Nations Kosovo Team/Tim UN-a za Kosovo	Peace and Development Officer/ Službenica Odjela za mir i razvoj	Pristina (KOS)
<b>Dr. Nicolas Moll</b>	Centar André Malraux	Historian and Consultant / Historičar i konsultant	Sarajevo (BiH) / Paris (F)
<b>Frank Morawietz</b>	French-German Youth Office / Francusko-njemački ured za mlade (OFAJ)	Special coordinator for the activities of OFAJ in SEE / Specijalni koordinator za aktivnosti OFAJa u Jugoistočnoj Evropi	Berlin (D)
<b>Dejan Motl</b>	JU Spomen-područje / Memorial Site Donja Gradina	Curator – historian / Kustos-historičar	Demirovac (BiH)
<b>Sudbin Musić</b>	Prijedor 92	Sekretar / Secretary	Prijedor (BiH)
<b>Zlatan Musić</b>	Balkan Investigative Reporting Network / Balkanske istraživačke mreže BIRN BiH	Programme Development Officer	Sarajevo (BiH)
<b>Nevena Negojević</b>	Forum za primenjenu istoriju / Forum for applied history	Finansijski menadžer i organizator programa /Financial manager and programme organiser	Beograd (SRB)
<b>Jacqueline Nießer</b>	Institute for applied history / Institut za primijenjenu istoriju	Project manager + PhD Student / Projektna menadžerica i doktorska	Berlin (D)

		kandidatkinja	
<b>Mirosław Obstarczyk</b>	State Museum / Državni muzej Auschwitz-Birkenau	Curator of the Exhibition Department / Kustos izložbenog odjela	Oswiecim (PL)
<b>Timon Perabo</b>	Anne Frank Zentrum / Centar Anne Frank	Project director “War children – life paths until today” / Direktor projekta “Djeca rata”	Berlin (D)
<b>Dr. Ljubinka Petrović-Ziemer</b>	Forum Civil Peace Service BiH/ Forum – Civilna Mirovna Služba – forumZFD BiH	Programska direktorica / Program director	Sarajevo (BiH)
<b>Nina Rabuza</b>	Max-Mannheimer- Studienzentrum	Education worker/ Obrazovna radnica	Dachau (D)
<b>Edin Ramulić</b>	Udruženje Prijedorčanki "Izvor" / Association of citizens of Prijedor «Izvor»	Potpredsjednik / Vice president	Prijedor (BiH)
<b>Dr. Günter Schlusche</b>	Berlin Wall Foundation / Fondacija Berlinski zid	Architect / Planner	Berlin (D)
<b>Tamara Šmidling</b>	Fondacija Mirovna Akademija / Peace Academy Foundation	Programska koordinatorica / Program coordinator	Sarajevo (BiH)
<b>Aleksandra Stamenković</b>	C31-Centar za razvoj kulture dečjih prava /Center for development of culture of children's rights	Zamenik predsednika / Deputy President	Beograd (SRB)
<b>Amela Suljić</b>	International Commission for missing persons/ Međunarodni komitet za nestale osobe (ICMP)	Western Balkan Regional Program Officer/ Programski službenik za region Zapadnog Balkana	Sarajevo (BiH)
<b>Juliane Tomann</b>	Institute for applied history / Institut za primijenjenu istoriju	Project manager + PhD Student / Projektna menadžerica i doktorska kandidatkinja	Frankfurt Oder (D)



**Annex 3:**  
**Guest of the reception organized by Memory Lab in Berlin the 21.10.2013**

Beatrix Austin, Berghof Stiftung

Tobias Flessenkemper, SWP

Verena Heinzl, Robert Bosch-Stiftung

Barbara Hust, Robert Bosch-Stiftung

Mirsad Maglajac, GIZ – Südosteuropa Abteilung

Branka Pavlovic, Filmemacherin

Manuela Matthes, Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung, Südosteuropa Abteilung

Walter Kaufmann, Heinrich-Böll-Stiftung, Osteuropa-Referent

Simone Erpel, Deutsches Historisches Museum

Hana Stojic, Traduki

Katharina Ochse, Goethe Institut

Georg Hagl, Auswärtiges Amt, Ref. 209 / Westlicher Balkan

Prof. Angela Richter, Südslawistik, Universität Halle

Frank Hofmann, SOE-Redakteur Deutsche Welle

Isabelle Maras, Stiftung Genshagen

Dr. Markus Ingenlath, Deutsch-Französisches Jugendwerk