

CONFERENCE REPORT:

PROMOTING A HOLISTIC APPROACH TO MEMORIALS AND REMEMBRANCE

Sarajevo 8-10 December 2010

Distribution:
General
Sarajevo, 16th May 2011
ICMP.JCSI.84.4.doc

I. INTRODUCTION

1. Further to its efforts to secure the co-operation of governments and other authorities in locating and identifying persons missing as a result of armed conflicts, other hostilities or violations of human rights and assisting them in doing so, the International Commission on Missing Persons (ICMP) also seeks to contribute to the development of appropriate expressions of commemoration and tribute to the missing.
2. ICMP believes it is time to begin a process of honoring the 40,000 people who went missing as a consequence of armed conflict, crimes against humanity, and other violations of human rights in the Western Balkans. Of the 40,000 who originally went missing, today 26,000 persons have been accounted for. That is no small feat and a testament to the efforts of the victim groups to ensure that their governments - whether it is Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia or Serbia - move forward with this process. It is also a testament to the governments who have made a considerable effort to try to locate, recover and identify individuals who are missing. In Bosnia Herzegovina, of the 30,000 people who were disappeared, today two-thirds have been accounted for and, since 2005 a non-discriminatory process has been established by the state, under the auspices of the Missing Persons Institute, to search for persons regardless of their ethnic, religious, or national origin. Recognizing that significant progress has been made toward accounting for those who went missing, it is now time to start thinking about how to commemorate the missing, regardless of their ethnic religious or national origin.
3. Bosnia and Herzegovina is currently in the process of developing a transitional justice strategy. The process itself includes consultation with governmental and civil society sectors. An expert working group, established by the BiH Council of Ministers in early 2010, is leading the process. This process is supported by UNDP. Memorials and commemoration are one of the key components of the strategy.
4. In recent decades, the memorial has increasingly been used as a component of the struggle for justice – as a form of symbolic reparation within the reparations sub-set of the transitional justice toolbox. Yet the memorial, within its broadest definition ranging from physical memorials, memorial plaques and monuments, to commemorations and days of remembrance, to museums of memory or museums of conscience, in its multiplicity of functions transcends the somewhat narrow definition of symbolic reparation.
5. Indeed, memorials are first and foremost about remembering, and often, in countries emerging from authoritarian rule, protracted state violence or armed conflict, they are about remembering and paying tribute to the victims. It is often with the victims of human rights abuse and atrocity in mind that memorials are constructed – and often by the families of those who were killed or disappeared. In many instances, they are built on the physical sites of terrible atrocities, or mass graves, and in so doing they not only make the space itself sacred but also provoke questions: How could this have happened? What can we do to prevent such human rights violations or atrocities from ever happening again? In this sense, the memorial serves at least two functions; one backward-looking, paying tribute to the victims and articulating narratives of remembrance; the other forward-looking and seeking to educate future generations so as to foster a culture of human rights which will guard against the perpetration of such crimes again in the future.
6. As a mechanism of transitional justice, memorials can address the legacies of the past. Memorials publicly acknowledge the individuals and groups, victims and survivors who suffered. They can reveal and make visible the names and stories and sometimes the faces of victims. They can force societies, by the processes of conceiving of and developing memorials, by commissioning and designing them, and by their very presence, to look inward and to critically examine what happened in a horrible time, and why.
7. In states emerging from conflict in which multiple groups, be they ethnic, national, religious, or racial, participated in hostilities, the persistence of multiple and often contradictory and contested narratives about the past can fracture society and frustrate efforts which aim at building a sustainable peace. The memorial form and the important process of its genesis, with its ability to self-consciously engage with

and confront themes of memory and history, testimonial and evidence, voice and narrative, can have a cathartic effect upon fractured societies after conflict. Both the process and the ultimate form of memorial deriving from the process can contribute to building solidarity across the conflict divide while also demonstrating that contradictory historical narratives can be made compatible or, at least, respectful of each other, which is perhaps the best gauge of true reconciliation. Within this cognitive framework, ICMP's Justice and Civil Society Initiatives supports and implements activities that contribute to the development of universal, or holistic, models of commemoration and remembrance of the missing.

8. In this context, ICMP's Justice and Civil Society Initiatives and the United Nations Development Programme in Bosnia and Herzegovina, in partnership with the Ministry of Justice and the Ministry of Human Rights and Refugees of Bosnia and Herzegovina co-organized a two-day regional conference, titled *Promoting a Holistic Approach to Memorials and Remembrance*, in Sarajevo on 8-10 December 2010. The United Nations Development Programme in Bosnia and Herzegovina, and the Swiss Ministry of Foreign Affairs, through a grant to the ICMP's Justice and Civil Society Initiatives, financed the conference.
9. Gathering more than 100 participants from family associations of missing persons, civil society groups and state institutions from Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia and Serbia, the conference was aimed at opening a deeper dialogue about models of commemoration and remembrance that are part of larger transitional justice efforts by society to deal with the legacy of conflict. The Conference was aimed in particular at initiating a process of creating a culture of memory relevant to missing persons and establishing socio-political pre-conditions to help build mutual understanding in divided societies while paying tribute to the victims.
10. At the conference, Louis Bickford an international authority on transitional justice with expertise in memorials and memory after conflict, and Gabriella Citroni, an international expert on missing persons issues and memorials discussed memorials and their role in post-authoritarian and post-conflict transitions. Transcripts of Bickford's and Citroni's presentations can be found in Annex III of this report. Also at the conference, Saliha Đuderija, Advisor to the Minister of Human Rights and Refugees of Bosnia and Herzegovina, discussed the legal framework for raising memorials in Bosnia and Herzegovina. She also introduced the process of developing the transitional justice strategy for Bosnia and Herzegovina. Colonel Ivan Grujić, Chairperson of the Republic of Croatia Commission on Missing Persons, discussed the legal framework in Croatia. Unfortunately, a representative of the Serbian Ministry of Labour and Social Policy, which is the competent authority for memorials in the Republic of Serbia, was unable to attend the conference.
11. The presentations of the conference speakers generated vigorous debate in both plenary session and later in the working group about memorials and their role in post-conflict societies in the Western Balkans. The key conclusions and recommendations that came out of the plenary session and working group have been clustered in this report around recurring themes that arose again and again during the course of the discussion. These themes comprise: 1) memorials within a broader transitional justice framework, 2) legal framework obstacles and challenges, 3) policy and obstacles and challenges in practice, 4) dealing with existing controversial memorials, 5) credit and blame, 6) commemoration and education, and 7) concrete proposals.
12. The conclusions coming out of the conference point to that fact that there is growing interest in memorials and remembrance and their function. There are multiple proposals as to how the victims should be remembered. But the discussion also revealed that there are in similar number multiple obstacles to be overcome to be able to develop a holistic approach to remembrance: legal frameworks are either inadequate or policies in the states concerned favor one group over another so that only one dominant narrative is heard, and generally only the victims or heroes of one group tend to be commemorated. The discussion also revealed that there was a consensus that memorials should be constructed in a way that does not offend. Yet, at the same time there were strong calls for memorials to not only pay respect to one's own victims, but also to apportion blame to the perpetrators. This

dichotomy of credit and blame may undermine efforts that aim *to do no harm* to the already complicated constellation of relationships between victim groups remembering the missing. The discussion also revealed that for a number of participants memorials are not necessary for the current generation, which already remembers the missing and does not need a memorial to do so. Rather memorials are for future generations to remember, and to learn from. It therefore follows that memorials must be conceived and developed in a way that they engage the younger generations. The obvious challenge is, however, how to achieve this without harming relations amongst victim groups and the communities they represent?

2. SELECTED CONCLUSIONS FROM THE CONFERENCE

2.1. Memorials within a broader transitional justice framework

13. The field of transitional justice tends to be defined by legal requirements of states, which are expressed as four categories of obligations in periods after mass atrocity or human rights abuse: to establish the truth about victims and perpetrators; to pursue criminal accountability of perpetrators; to develop reparations programs for victims; and to take steps to guarantee non-repetition, often understood as the obligation to pursue institutional reforms. Memorials are often conceptually located in the realm of “reparations”. Yet, this conceptual constellation does not recognize that memorials are more than an acknowledgement of the victims’ suffering, which is of course of huge importance in its own right. They are in fact public markers that confront perpetrators, bystanders and society. They ask questions. They prompt conversations -societal conversations- about the past. But in order to be able to do that they must be engaging, that is they must be conceived in such a way as to be relevant to the community, to the society in which they are located. Failure to achieve this can result in the memorial becoming unseen, forgotten – a mechanism not of remembrance and dialogue but of oblivion and silence.
14. Amir Kulagić, (Member of the Transitional Justice Strategy Development Working Group), posed the question: “What is the precondition to build memory in Bosnia? What should be done in Bosnian society in one universal way to cultivate a culture of remembrance? Do you open a debate, or simply copy and paste some experience from Europe or the world?” Louis Bickford pointed out that the purpose of showing global experiences in his presentation was not to suggest what should or should not be done. Rather, whatever happens in Bosnia and Herzegovina needs to be driven by the people in this context. Memory tends to create conflict. So, a real transitional justice process needs to ask questions how to deal with memory. Commemoration is deeply connected to transitional justice more broadly, so you do need prosecutions, reparations. In terms of sequencing, you can have all these things in the same time. Except that, you do need to have facts before you put names on a memorial, but beyond that, there is no reason to do some things first and other things after that.”
15. Bećir Macić (Institute for Research of Crimes against Humanity and International Law) asked: Is there a general criterion for the erection of monuments in post-conflict periods, while still respecting the nature, the essence of the armed conflict?
16. Louis Bickford suggested: “the criterion depends on the goals that different people involved are setting. So for example if the purpose of a memorial is psychological healing, if that’s the goal, then the real criterion is how can this be constructed in a way that helps people heal. If the goal is this much more hard-to-achieve yet very interesting goal of ‘never again,’ then that means a whole different set of questions. That means signing it in a way that will help contribute to never again. And the way you contribute to never again is by asking important questions, by generating discussion, dialogue, by working across communities. I guess the one criterion of all that I would say is the most important is the principle of ‘do no harm.’ So, in that sense, I think there are many examples of very provocative memorials. Memorials that have been established by one group but end up really also provoking hostility from another group and that’s a very tricky question because obviously victims have a right to

memorialize in a way that works for them.”

“[Commemoration] is very easy in mono-ethnic societies, in societies with a highly developed, civilized, civil structure. But in societies with a mixed national, ethnic, religious composition, I think of Bosnia and Herzegovina, then it is a far more sensitive issue and it should be approached primarily with the support of politics. If there is political support, and we know that it has significant influence on the public, then it is likely that there will be popular support for memorials irrespective of whether they reflect different perceptions and different relations,” said Nedeljko Mitrović (Board of the families of captured fighters and missing civilians of Republika Srpska).

2.2. Legal framework obstacles and challenges

17. In Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia and Serbia legal frameworks exist for raising memorials and commemorating the victims. However the discussion brought into sharp relief the fact that the legal frameworks are imperfect, resulting in the memorialization of only certain groups within society while other victims and sites of suffering, perhaps deliberately, slip through the cracks.

“In Bosnia and Herzegovina the laws on construction and urban planning in BiH are a legal basis for raising memorials”, said Saliha Đuderija adding, “one must apply to the local competent institution in order to place a memorial plaque. There are no legal obstacles preventing family associations from applying to do so.”

“We have some municipalities that have answered some inquiries that they do not mark the place of burial if mortal remains have not been exhumed from these places. Before they issue permits, municipalities must first get confirmation from the Missing Persons Institute that persons have been exhumed from the site. [...] Concerning place of captivity and torture, some local communities have condoned raising memorials in such places”, said Đuderija.

18. The principle deficiency in the legislation in Bosnia and Herzegovina is the absence of a law that regulates the commemoration or raising memorials on the sites of prison camps, places of rape and execution sites. Under the existing legal framework only missing persons can be commemorated. Article 20 of the Law on Missing Persons provides for marking the sites of mass graves with the prior approval of the Missing Persons Institute and consent of the local authorities. With no legislation in place, it is up to the local authorities to make decisions, often on the basis of subjective preference, as to which sites of suffering and other categories of victims may be commemorated.

“This Law, Article 20, cannot compensate for the lack of legislation for other victims. [...] The question arises: can a site of suffering come under state protection, so that such sites are not destroyed - as is now reportedly planned to happen to the house in Visegrad where a large number of people were burned to death,” said Merdijana Sadović (Institute of War and Peace Reporting).

19. Nura Begović (Association of Citizens Women of Srebrenica) drew attention to the limitations even of Article 20 of the Law on Missing Persons. “I become very frustrated when I read these ugly laws, which are supposed to give satisfaction in equal measure for what was done to us. In Srebrenica a memorial plaque should be placed to pay respect to the innocent civilian victims killed in 1993. [...] A shell killed several children, but their remains could not be found [so according to the legislation a memorial plaque cannot be placed there],” said Begović.

“The legislation on the commemoration of sites and memorials that we currently have should be amended. It is deficient and not adequate for marking sites of suffering. There is a need for further dialogue so that memorials are in future raised based on consensus,” said Šefika Muratagić (Citizens Association Key of Future).

20. Bećir Macić also drew attention to the need to preserve sites of suffering which is not currently regulated by legislation in Bosnia and Herzegovina. “In Visegrad how can we protect the buildings where crimes were committed? Privatization is threatening the preservation of sites of suffering. New owners are trying to pull down these buildings or deny access to them,” said Macić.
21. Addressing the challenge of raising memorials on private property, Ljiljana Alvir (Union of Associations of Families of Captured and Missing Croatian Defenders) gave the example of raising a memorial to the Croatian civilians that were killed by Serb forces after the fall of Vukovar in 1991 at Ovčara, in eastern Croatia. Alvir pointed out that when the land where the killings took place was to be privatized, the Croatian government bought up the part where the memorial now stands.
22. In Croatia, the only relevant Law on raising memorials relates solely to sites of mass graves of Homeland war victims killed during the "Greater Serbian aggression". This law refers only to killed war veterans, while civilian victims are not mentioned. Further, there is no legislation in Croatia that regulates commemorating sites of suffering, that is, prison camps, rape sites or sites where atrocity crimes were committed during the conflict. There is no specific legislation that regulates the commemoration of missing persons.

2.3. Policy and obstacles and challenges in practice

23. The conference revealed also that there are not only limitations in the legal framework for commemorating victims but also obstacles and challenges in practice which is closely linked to memorial policy in the countries concerned. The discussion underlined the difference of opinion of state institutions on the one hand and civil society on the other with regard to memorial policy and practice in Croatia. The discussion also revealed that in Bosnia and Herzegovina, in practice, raising a memorial to victims of one ethnic group in a municipality where another ethnic group is in the majority can be a major challenge.
24. Ivan Grujić drew attention to the fact that in Croatia “there is a need to honor the victims. One way of doing this is by building memorials, which raise our awareness and bring us closer. It was this ‘bringing us closer’ that the recent visit by the Presidents of Croatia and Serbia was dedicated. [...] A thematic museum at Ovčara has been opened, a memorial cemetery has been made and a central monument to the dead and missing has been erected in Zagreb.”

“Monuments are not designed exclusively for one population. We have a mass grave in which there are only persons of Serbian nationality, which is part of the programme of commemoration. [...] There are actually a lot of monuments [to Serb victims], for example the monument in Paulin Dvor built by the local authorities. Ivo Josipović visited that monument during the visit of Boris Tadić. There are many of these sorts of memorials in Croatia. Also, there was one location where Bosnians were brought from Bosnia and were killed,” said Grujić.

25. Emphasizing that “the Republic of Croatia is a state of rule of law”, Grujić did however concede “in raising memorial plaques we have a problem with resolving property disputes in locations where they are placed. [And] if it is thought that something in the law is wrong, the possibility of amending it always exists.”
26. Čedomir Marić (Family Association of Missing Persons “Suza”) pointed out that he had “a completely different approach to all this [commemorating victims in Croatia]. Due to the circumstances in which we found ourselves we were forced to lobby to obtain a memorial. The first memorial, something very modest, was raised in Belgrade, to the Serbian victims of the wars between 1991 and 2000. For two or three years, the associations of families went through the streets carrying flowers and lighting candles. They made an impromptu memorial plaque, which they left in front of the institutions together with an invitation to erect a memorial.”

“I know [of the memorial in] Paulin Dvor. I know of Varivode. And I know of the memorial plaque which was set up by the Youth Initiative for Human Rights Croatia ahead of the anniversary of Operation Storm in Knin, [but] I say that the policy [in Croatia] does not allow us to convey our feelings and to be treated equally in the same areas. I did not want to say that there are no memorials to Serbian victims. If the law says that there should be a memorial at each site where mass killings took place, then there should be... And Koranski most is a place of mass murder. I am pointing out these facts. How many more years must we wait for a small plaque to be placed in Knin, Petrinja ... anywhere? [...] In Croatia some 8,000 citizens of Serbian nationality perished. [...] So we have to build awareness that in all places where there were casualties there must be memorials and that it is sacred,” said Marić.

“Yes, it is [written] in the laws [in Croatia] that it is possible to raise a memorial to others [non-Croats], but in practice it cannot be done, when all the permits must be obtained,” said Nura Begović.

“Without political will there is no shift in policy. In Varivode the first memorial that recalls the suffering of civilians was raised in 2004 with the financial support of the Serbian National Council from Kistanje. A similar modest cross was erected in Gospić. And the truth is that there is a memorial in Paulin Dvor. Should relatives of those killed wait for their case to be next on the list? These are all open questions, although, in fact, it is largely a matter of political will. The Youth Initiative has stimulated public debate, which is very useful. It is important to set the record, but it is important to encourage discussion. Debate is very important in this context,” said Vesna Teršelič (Documenta).

27. Concerning Bosnia and Herzegovina, Kada Hotić (Association of citizens "Mothers of Srebrenica and Zepa Enclaves") underlined the difficulty of commemorating victims of the Srebrenica genocide in the Republika Srpska: “When we commemorate victims, we visit the warehouse in Kravica, where people were killed. However, we cannot leave any flowers there which will not be removed half an hour later, let alone erect a memorial.”
28. Sarafina Kolovrat (Association of Families of Fallen and Missing Defenders of Homeland War from Municipality Bugojno) echoed the concerns of many participants; while legislation may provide some scope for commemorating the victims, in terms of practice at the local level implementation is patchy and is often entirely dependent on the willingness of the local authorities to grant the necessary permits. “We submitted an application to the Municipal Council [in Bugojno] to build a memorial but the Municipal Council never responded. And so in the end we made a memorial in the Catholic cemetery,” said Kolovrat.

2.4. Dealing with existing controversial memorials

29. Many participants raised concerns about the many memorials that have already been raised that are subjects of controversy for one or more of Bosnia and Herzegovina’s constituent nations. Discussion revealed the fears of many participants that these existing memorials in fact do much harm, causing such consternation and anger they may act as slow burning fuses to future conflict. Dealing with such memorials is no easy task. The expert opinion put forward is that removing controversial memorials is not the best way forward since this often only exacerbates tensions. Rather the key to addressing controversial memorials is finding a way of enabling memorials to co-exist in a way that is respectful of all.

“What to do with the existing memorials, of which there are many, and which are built to intimidate the other side?” asked Edin Ramulić (Izvor).

“How do we deal with what has already been done? It is important because of the younger generations. How far have we come in the last twenty years if a child in Potočari greets a Bosniak with three fingers [a symbol of Serbdom]?” asked Čedomir Marić.

30. Kada Hotić asked: “Are memorials some sort of satisfaction for what has happened to us? Of course it should be remembered. But can we turn the existing memorials into a warning to people who produce wars? We have a memorial to the invasion and memorials to those who do not deserve to be remembered, for example Draža Mihailović. There should be international laws to punish those who raise such monuments. [...] We don’t know what's good for the future. We have to remember, but we must prevent.”

“We have thousands of memorials which are not about victims. In Pilica, in front of the school where people were killed, stands a monument to Serbian heroes; or the cross in Srebrenica on the Serbian tower, or in Počitelj,” said Munira Subašić (Association of citizens "Mothers of Srebrenica and Žepa Enclaves”).

31. Sead Golić (Association for tracing missing and killed Bosniaks of District Brčko) pointed out that in Brčko “there were three or four warring parties, and [...] three monuments within 200 meters of each other. One is to the ‘Serbian Liberators of Brčko’. There are also monuments to Croatian and Muslim fighters. Now a memorial to the civilian victims is being built which has been imposed by international insistence because we could not reach agreement. How would you combine the four monuments, so that they reveal the real truth?”
32. In response Louis Bickford said “The idea of removing memorials is always the most controversial [because] you make people angry. The question is: is there a way to engage with the hostile memorial? I don’t trust efforts to make a single narrative so much. I would not merge, in general. Disagreement about history can be ok, if it is a part of a conversation, not a screaming match. To not be a screaming match, you can create spaces to have a dialogue. I don’t know the context [in Bosnia and Herzegovina] well enough; so let me talk about other places. In Cape Town, in the Natural History Museum, they had very racist exhibits of native people throwing spears - they look like animals. They could have eliminated it [after the end of apartheid]. Instead, they created a space in the museum to discuss it. Sites of conscience, sites of memory, groups, say ‘We can transform these places to places of dialogue, communication’. It is very hard if the place is a sacred space for one community, then it is hard to bring different communities in these places. I’ve seen all over the world examples of having, on the one side of the road, cemeteries, and on the other hand places where people were engaged in a dialogue. Perhaps that’s the way to do it, and Potočari may be an example.”
33. Answering the question: What should we do with the memorials that have already been made? Marko Jurišić (Missing Persons Institute, BiH) asserted: “The most damaging thing would be to pull them down. Who should say that they are inappropriate? [...] They should be transformed, with a universal message. I think that the first step, and this is not a new idea, would be to jointly visit such places to commemorate the victims.”

2.5. Credit and blame

34. Memorials are involved in the construction of collective memory, and that construction depends above all on the universal human tendency to construct narratives – to tell stories – whose essence is that they assign credit and blame. Struggles over collective memory pivot on credit and blame. Both involve the identification of outcomes, competence, responsibility and us-them boundaries. Memorials and the stories that they tell invariably create or reinforce divisions by pointing to how ‘good’ we are, as opposed to how ‘bad’ they are. War stimulates collective attributions of credit and blame more often than any other human activity. In assigning credit the ‘good’ may be fallen fighters, or innocent civilian victims, whereas the ‘bad’ are known or perceived perpetrators of war crimes, or simply the aggressors. In post-conflict memorialization practice in the Western Balkans credit can be clearly discerned in monuments to perceived ‘liberators’ but also in memorials to innocent victims, whereas blame is apportioned often in memorials to victims that also point the finger of responsibility at either certain individuals or one ethnic group. Such memorials of credit and blame are perhaps a very human response after conflict, where each group that was in conflict seeks justification for either its loss or

gains, and tries to advance its own interpretations of what occurred in the past. In fractured societies such memorialization practice because of its tendency to exacerbate us-them differences can however lay the seeds of future conflict. For this reason alone, memorials matter.

35. While it was recognized that messages on memorial plaques should not offend, demands for blame to be apportioned are strong: “Offensive content should not be written on memorial plaques, and it is understandable that if it were written that 3,000 Bosniaks were killed it would make some people angry. But, in addition to the names of the victims, the names of those people who have judgments against them, those who have been convicted of the killings should be written on memorial plaques. Believe me, I think that it would then be a lesson,” said Amela Meduseljac (Association “Women Victims of War”).

“Universal Memorials should not obscure the facts that must be inscribed on other memorials, where the victims were from only one nation. On them, we must write who the victims and who the perpetrators are. If you do not have consensus about this, it is best to use the court-established facts of the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia (ICTY) and national courts. [...] Despite the circumstances in which we found ourselves in July 1995, we carefully chose the words on the [Potocari] memorial so as not to insult anyone. Only now, after two courts have used the word "genocide", will we inscribe that word on the memorial,” said Hasan Nuhanović (Potočari Memorial Center).

36. Concerns were expressed that memorials that refer to one ethnic group as either victims or perpetrators, i.e. that apportion credit and blame, may in the future incite younger generations to seek revenge. “I’m afraid that even if a memorial is to my people, I’m afraid that my son will want to take revenge. It is better to say that "innocent people" and not "Bosniaks" were killed,” said Ervin Blažević (NGO Optimisti 2001).
37. One idea put forward proposed strengthening the principle of solidarity among victims across the conflict divide to extricate memorial practice in Bosnia and Herzegovina from the potentially dangerous spiral of credit and blame. “The problem with us victims is that when we are fighting for the rights of victims, we are fighting for the rights of *our* victims. I expect the Serb representatives to condemn the memorial raised to Serb soldiers in Trnopolje. We should all fight for the rights of others, for example, to fight for the commemoration of Serb victims in Sarajevo. And we should not seek justification in others,” said Blažević.

2.6. Commemoration and education

38. Alongside memorials, education has a key role to play in terms of dealing with the past in post-conflict societies. Numerous participants commented on the need for education about [dealing with] the past for a younger generation often raised in fear of and segregated from other ethnic groups in Bosnia and Herzegovina. It was suggested that memorials have limits in terms of what they can and cannot say about the past, and that therefore education is complimentary to them.

“I am afraid that our youth will be worse than we are. They are more fired by nationalism than we are,” said Munira Subašić.

“We have a problem with the younger generations... Why isn’t pressure put on the Ministry of Education to introduce a memorial visiting programme, regardless of nationality?” asked Nura Begović.

“I would like to connect [commemoration] with education. Children should learn a unified history,” said Zvonimir Kubinek (Association of Families of Croatian Defenders Fallen and Missing from Homeland War Soli – Tuzla).

“We do not need memorials to remind us of something, rather we need them to educate others,” said Ervin Blažević.

“Memorials should not have national or religious characteristics; they should be dedicated to the victims and have an educational dimension,” said Anđelko Kvesić (Croatian Association of Former Camp Inmates of Homeland War in Srednja Bosna Canton).

“What is the purpose of a monument? To honor the victims? To have an educational character? To cause shame? Or to encourage reconciliation? One of our interlocutors, a Bosniak, said that there is no need to show guilt, rather [memorials] should be a lesson for the future,” said Merdijana Sadović.

“It would be good for transitional justice to grow into something that will give young people education; to invite a school from one entity, and one from another, and to tell them how it really was. Children must know this so that it does not happen to them. What is at stake is their future,” said Hatidža Mehmetović.

“We are different people, with different cultures and different values in our lives [...]. I do not need a monument to remind me of what happened in my past, I am a part of the past in which we all live. I am more for a concept in which the power of memory is built in all future generations who will be able to learn from our memories. Memorials disappear, but humanity must rely on the values that we should create and pass on to our children,” said Saliha Đuderija.

2.7. Concrete proposals

39. The conference resulted in a number of commemoration proposals being put forward. Proposals ranged from the raising of memorials, both representatives and abstract, to joint commemoration visits. Some participants proposed that memorials should in fact be secondary to strengthening human rights protection overall. Others drew attention to that fact that work is needed to create a climate propitious for memorialization. Expert international opinion was that the discussion revealed a need to discuss and explore how the process of determining the form of any future memorial in its broadest sense should look; to identify and determine the central elements of the process, not least what the objectives of the commemoration project are so as to guide the process, and ultimately the memorial form.
40. In terms of official apologies, which was the theme addressed by one of the conference working groups, the following conclusions were drawn: a) an affirmative attitude toward apologies is required - apologies are necessary and welcome; b) apologies cannot ease the pain, but bring hope; c) insincere apologies deepen mistrust and trauma; d) an apology should not be just empty words – apologies should be supported and followed by action through which commitment and readiness to deal with the past is clearly demonstrated (prosecutions, fact-finding, solving the fate of the missing, compensation, restitution, rehabilitation and re-socialization of the victims, memorialization, institutional reforms, dialogue about the past etc.).

“Here in Bosnia and Herzegovina other things need to be done before monuments are made. The law on missing persons is not functional. The BiH Office the Prosecutor must be strengthened to verify who did what. We need to bring a new law on the (prevention of) human rights violations. [...] So we need to strengthen human rights in Bosnia first, then memorials,” said Munira Subašić.

“We have such a climate that we need a mass of police officers to accompany us in Dobrovaljčka Street to simply light a candle. The Bosniaks need police to come to Visegrad and place a memorial plaque. Let's create an environment in which raising a memorial is sustainable,” said Boro Peulić (Republican Organization of Killed and Detained Soldiers and Missing Persons of Republic Srpska, Republican Board of Families of Missing).

“I have three conclusions concerning the process: 1) It takes time, really; [...] today's discussion shows that we still cannot discuss with cool heads; 2) the problem is the implementation on the ground, regardless of legislation; and 3) we need more dialogue and events of this kind,” said Šefika Muratagić.

“What would I like a monument to missing persons to look like? The most important thing is that no monument should insult others. When you analyze the monuments in BiH, most are religious, national, and only then do they have universal characteristics. The universal message – in the case of the missing – could be best be achieved by combining universal forms such as faceless, genderless statuary, war memorials, and memorial centers,” said Marko Jurišić.

“I propose joint visits to places where crimes were committed and joint memorial services to the victims. Five Serbs, five Croats and five Bosniaks together in one place paying their respects to the victims would have a greater impact than any politicians getting together,” added Jurišić.

“Our proposal would be to build a joint memorial to all citizens of Bugojno. This would follow the example of the "eye that cries" in Peru,” said Serafina Kolobrat.

“I propose that we make a joint memorial - a living monument. It might be a giant light that would always be illuminated, somewhere in central Bosnia and Herzegovina, for example, Doboj-Žepče...” said Ahmed Grahić (Union of Bosniak Associations of Families of Captured and Missing Persons in Bosnia and Herzegovina).

“I have a proposal... A new government is going to be formed in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Let's aim to have completed a universal memorial center in BiH by this day [December 10th] in 2014,” said Zvonimir Kubinek.

“I am for a concept, which will have a legal framework, which will enter the state, which will be financed by the state, which will in future help us overcome these problems. [...] A concept is very easy to develop if we know what we want; that is if we make an environment in which individuals are involved, in which victims are involved, but it is the state that must make the concept that will enable us to preserve a culture of memory,” said Saliha Đuderija.

41. Louis Bickford suggested that future discussion should explore further what a memorial *process* for the missing might look like. Bickford suggested that such a process might involve: identifying the goals of a memorial process in a participatory way involving all stakeholders, especially victim groups and civil society, designing a competition process with a jury looking into different proposals; getting proposals from broader groups – school children, poets, etc.; and discussing what works the best in terms of transmitting the message to the future generation – plaques, tombstones, or abstract works. The answers to these questions can only be reached by further discussion and debate.

III. NEXT STEPS

42. In 2011 ICMP plans to:

- Facilitate a series of discussions – a regional dialogue – among civil society (family associations of the missing, other victim groups, and human rights NGOs) from Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia and Serbia on memorials and remembrance with the aim of determining recommendations that will contribute to the development of universal forms of commemoration of missing persons from the countries concerned;
- Provide technical assistance on memorials and remembrance, drawing on best practice and lessons learned from a global perspective;
- Facilitate study visits for representatives of family associations of the missing to memorials at

sites of suffering in Europe so as to increase their knowledge of the multiplicity of forms of memorials;

- Provide grants to family associations of the missing and their partners in support of projects which aim at developing universal forms of commemoration;
- Convene a trilateral Presidential-level meeting of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia and Serbia to discuss issues relating to the search for, and identification of, missing persons. At the meeting recommendations and proposals coming out of the regional dialogue on universal commemoration of the missing will be presented. The anticipated outcome of this meeting would be an agreement on implementation of the regional dialogue recommendations;
- Support respectful forms of commemoration on August 30th, the International Day of the Disappeared, and December 10th, International Human Rights Day.

43. The ICMP has no *a priori* preference for any particular model of remembrance.

44. In the area of transitional justice, in 2011 UNDP plans to:

- Continue providing technical and administrative support to the Expert Working Group leading the process of developing the Transitional Justice Strategy so as to finalize the text proposal of the Strategy;
- Facilitate a series of discussions between civil society groups and governmental representatives in the framework of public debate on the first draft text of the Strategy;
- Support the process of development the Action plan for implementing the Transitional Justice Strategy once it is approved by the respective authorities;
- Provide grants to civil society organizations working in the field of transitional justice and access to justice;
- Support specific outreach activities dedicated to increase understanding and awareness on transitional justice issues;
- Continue coordination and work with other organizations engaged in the field of transitional justice.

Annex I: List of Working Group Participants on Memorials and remembrance for missing persons

1. Ervin Blažević, President, Optimisti 2004
2. Gabriella Citroni, University of Milan
3. James May, Coordinator, Fund Biljana Kovačević Vučo
4. Goran Bubalo, Project Director, Catholic Relief Service
5. Josip Drežnjak, President, Association of Croat Victims Grabovica '93 Mostar
6. Sarafina Kolovrat, President, Association of Families of Fallen and Missing Defenders of Homeland War from Municipality Bugojno
7. Boro Peulić, President, Republican Organization of Killed and Detained Soldiers and Missing Persons of Republic Srpska, Republican Board of Families of Missing
8. Čedomir Marić, President, Association citizens "Suza"
9. Semina Alekić, Secretary, Organization of Families of Killed, Captured and Missing Persons "Vrbanja" Kotor Varos
10. Ema Čekić, President, Association of families of missing persons of Municipality Vogosca
11. Sari Wastell, Resercher, Goldsmiths University
12. Šefika Muratagić, Executive Director, Citizens Association Key of Future
13. Anđelko Kvesić, President, Croatian Association of Former Camp Inmates of Homeland War in Srednja Bosna Canton
14. Sarah Quillinan, PhD Candidate, University of Melbourne
15. Ljiljana Alvir, Secretary, Parents and Families of Detained and Forcibly Taken Away Croatian Defenders "Vukovar Mothers"
16. Julijana Rosandić, President, Union of the Associations of Croatian Civilian Victims of Homeland War of Croatia
17. Marko Jurišić, Member of the Board of Directors, Missing Persons Institute of Bosnia and Herzegovina
18. Ahmet Grahić, President, Union of Bosniak Associations of Families of Captured and Missing Persons in Bosnia and Herzegovina
19. Šuhra Sinanović, President, Association of Citizens "Women of Podrinje"
20. Munira Subašić, President, Association of citizens "Mothers of Srebrenica and Zepa Enclaves"
21. Mehmed Musić, President, Association "For Missing from Hadzici"
22. Louis Bickford, International Expert in the area of Transitional Justice, New York University
23. Matthew Holliday, Coordinator, ICMP, Justice and Civil Society Initiatives Department
24. Violeta Burić-Milošević, Regional Program Officer, ICMP, Justice and Civil Society Initiatives Department

Annex II: List of Working Group Participants on Public Apologies

1. Kada Hotić (Srebrenica Mothers)
2. Murat Tahirović (BiH Association of Concentration Camp Prisoners)
3. Munevera Avdić (Missing Persons' Association - Kotor Varoš)
4. Zvonimir Kubinek (a member of MPI's Advisory Board)
5. Ljiljana Alvir (Vukovar Mothers Association - Croatia)
6. Nedeljko Mitrović (RS missing persons' association)
7. Obrad Bubić (RS Association of Concentration Camp Prisoners)
8. Olgica Božanić (Kosovo Serb Missing Persons Association)
9. Seida Karabašić (Association of Prijedor Women Izvor)
10. Selma Korjenić (TRIAL)
11. Lidija Škaro (ICMP)
12. Slavica Marinović (Association of civilian war victims of Homeland war - Croatia)
13. Janko Velimirović (RS center for war crimes investigation)
14. Boro Peulić (a member of MPI's Advisory Board)
15. Bećir Macić (Institute for research of crimes against humanity and international law)
16. Fikret Grabovica (association of families of killed children from Sarajevo)
17. Sanela Paripović (UNDP, project manager of Access to Justice project)
18. Dragan M. Popović (UNDP, International Transitional Justice Specialist – moderator)

Louis Bickford, Lecturer New York University

Thank you very much. It's an honor to be back here and talking about this topic I did talk about this topic once before about 5 years ago but I think my presentation has changed somewhat since then if any of you were here for that. What I would like to talk about is the question of how we remember conflict. I'm looking at global comparisons. I'm not going to talk at all about this particular context about which I know very little. So my real question, and I've been exploring this for really over a decade or more, is how do different societies remember past periods of conflict or trauma or authoritarian rule, crimes against humanity, etc? And I would say that we are witnessing in the world two different paradigms: a kind of classic paradigm and a newer paradigm that begins after the second world war. And the classic paradigm has a few different characteristics to it. One is that there is this notion that after a conflict or after a transition you get rid of, sort of, out with the old in with the new. You get rid of former symbols and you replace them with new symbols. I'll show you some images that explain these in some ways. There's a real emphasis... there's a gender aspect to memory in the classic paradigm. It tends to be male heroes, male imagery often because men are involved directly in some ways in war and it's in some way drawing off that but there might be some other reasons for that as well. There is an emphasis on the glory of the nation or the mourning, grieving, sadness about the fallen. So it's either glory or mourning and there's been a traditional emphasis in memory projects in nation building and the idea of pulling together the nation. So let me show you some examples of what I consider the classic paradigm.

This is this completely artificial moment, choreographed moment, during the invasion of Iraq. American forces pulled down statues of Saddam Hussein. Obviously this evokes a set of images of pulling down Stalin statues, Lenin statues. The idea that the old regime is being swept away and the new set of symbols is replacing it. This is a classic kind of nation-building image in the United States the most important nation building period was the early 20th century actually, end of the 19th century-early 20th century, after the US civil war Abraham Lincoln was president and this becomes a very important part of nation-building in the US.

This monumental, gigantic figures... This is in the Democratic Republic of Congo. This is Laurent Kabila, he comes into town, takes over, builds a huge statue of himself to commemorate his victory to his regime. We've all seen so many of these, no? In so many places throughout our lives.

War museums. Classic idea of sort of the classic paradigm. The war museum, this is the Yakusuni war museum in Tokyo that celebrates the glory, the power of war if maybe also the pathos of war, but usually the glory of war. So many images of mourning, grieving, and sadness this is a very important memorial in the United States, the Vietnam Veterans memorial, quite famous for its architectural design. And by the way I'm only going to talk for 25 minutes or so and then hopefully we can have some comments and/or questions. I can explain any of these in more depth if anyone is interested.

One is in Santiago, Chile. The motif of cemeteries, very common in this classic paradigm. These are places of sadness and mourning and death and therefore you commemorate them by using cemetery images and they become spaces that resemble cemeteries. This is a memorial in Santiago, Chile to two disappeared people whose bodies were found when they were found by the side of the road in this exact spot. So these two gravestones these two bodies here these are commemorative gravestones by the side of the road in Santiago. So this provides a glimpse of the classic paradigm of sation and using the use of monuments in post-conflict or transitional settings I would say. I think we are very much globally entering a new paradigm. And this again these are parallel in a ways the new paradigm begins in some ways in 1956 with the Hiroshima museum which I'll show you in a moment.

The new paradigm is very linked to transitional justice. That is about confronting the past to build a better future. It's, the term "never again" came up. This new paradigm is very much linked to this "never again." What can we do to engage in memory? With traumatic memory? How can we engage with traumatic memory in a way that leads to "never again"? It's not an obvious thing actually. It's a hard question that. It's a very, very difficult question. What is it about engaging with memory that would help us prevent it in the future?

There's no obvious linkage. So it's a linkage that needs to be thought about. And this paradigm thinks a lot about this question. What can we do to do that? To make that linkage? This paradigm is very inclusive. It's not about the top male heroes. It's not about necessarily the dominant ethnic group in a particular society. It's about inclusion. It's about conversation. It's about non-powerful groups articulating memory in a public space. There is a part of it that is about civic engagement, dialogue, and the idea of generating discussion about the past. Some of it is very much about teaching, about future generations. How can we teach about the past? How can we learn about the past? How can we integrate that into our schools, curriculum? The way we learn about the past to move into the future. And it's increasingly being integrated into post-conflict reconstruction and peace building strategies all around the world. So that in a number of post-conflict settings that I have been working in this is increasingly something on the agenda to be discussed. I consider this to be the best site that I know personally or one of the best. This is Hiroshima Peace Memorial Museum. It's really an amazing space. They've saved some of the buildings that were destroyed by the atomic bomb. They have created a museum, quite an impressive museum. But at the same time they have a number of very individualized memorials throughout the island. This is on an island in a river in the city of Hiroshima and these personalized memorials are very, very powerful. Each one of them designed by small, small groups or families for people who died and so it's a space that combines many different things. It combines grieving with learning with pedagogy and to me the most interesting thing about it is that it's about the future this is also a theme that came up earlier. It's about the future. The purpose of this site is to prevent nuclear war. That's in a way one of the purposes. I forget the name of the survivors of the Hiroshima attack; I think they're called hibachi or hikachi. Does somebody remember the name of the word for survivors? There is a word. They think of it as a very important space for their healing but the way it's been articulated is that it's a space where they can heal and they can contribute to preventing nuclear war in the future.

This is the conversion of a war museum in Spain. This is in Barcelona. The Montjuïc Castle in Barcelona is being converted from a war museum into a conference center, a peace-studies center, a space for discussing peace and post-conflict reconstruction and just vice so it's being converted from a war museum to a very active space of pedagogy where they draw...it's also a prison. This is also a former political prison. So they're drawing off the power of this space to achieve those other goals.

Speaking of space, one of the questions that comes up in these spaces is are they sacred space or are they civic space? So are these spaces places that you would go the way you would go to a cemetery or are they like a museum? And to be honest...a new museum, an active museum. So that balance is increasingly, or those two different ideas are increasingly joining up. So that causes some problems in some places. So for example this...clearly a sacred space...you would not have lunch here, you wouldn't sit here and have a hotdog or something you wouldn't or cevapcici, you wouldn't go here and play games, this is very much a sacred space. This is the Kurdish gas attack memorial in Halabja, Iraq in Kurdistan, Iraq.

However this space is very different. It's very different...this is the memorial to the murdered Jews in Europe. I believe some people are going to go to Berlin soon and maybe a number of you have seen this already. This is right at the center of Berlin, right at the Brandenburg gate. What is this? Well, it's sort of a cemetery but it's also not a cemetery. It's a place that people go, that people engage, people walk through it, people touch it, people sit on it, people think, ideally, one hopes that people think about it. Now I'm not saying that this works perfectly. There's a bit of an identity crisis here about whether this is a sacred space or civic space. So some people feel deeply offended that this child is jumping on these things that resemble gravestones. Other people feel that that's exactly what should happen here. We want people to go to these spaces. We want people to engage with them and interact with them and learn from them. We want this to be a part of our lives...not something that's remote and distant but something that we actually touch. And this is the place where the olden, the classic and new paradigm come together. So is this classic paradigm or is this new paradigm? It's not sure yet but I would say it's kind of in the new paradigm. It also has a museum, an underground museum in this space, which is a narrative museum which describes the events being commemorated.

Let me move to Charles Tilly. Charles Tilly is a sociologist who died recently. His last book...in my view one of the great sociologists of the 20th century...his last book was called "Credit and Blame." So a lifetime of thinking about the world and he comes up in his last book with the idea that the biggest problem is that memory tends to be about either credit or blame. That is the way we remember, our articulation of memory, tends to be

either 'look how great we are' or 'look how bad they are' and that that needs to be broken in his view. We need to break with that and we need to move into articulations of memory that aren't about Us/them and aren't about credit and blame. I'm not sure by the way if the interpreter...if the word credit...I should make sure that's clear here but what I mean but I'm assuming it works in translation. But anyway credit in this sense means we're good, we're justified, we're right, we're the good ones. Blame means they're the bad ones.

So for example in a lot of the memory images in Cambodia are precisely this kind of narrative about the Khmer Rouge, the regime that basically destroyed Cambodia from 1977 to 1979. So you see a lot of images, and narratives, and memory sites that talk about how bad and how evil the Khmer Rouge were. This is just one of the many examples. This says...this is a certain kind of tree against which executioners beat children. They used to say that bullets were too expensive and so they would have to...they would kill the children directly by bashing their heads against these trees. That's an awful, terrible thing so how do you engage with that? This is, you know, a kind of credit-blame way of doing it. There may be more creative ways of doing it than this and in a way that's my point.

The Yasukuni War Crime Museum, Tokyo. This extreme narrative of both victimization of the Japanese and heroism of the Japanese...it is all about credit and blame. It's all about making the Japanese both the right ones, the victims, while the rest of the world are the wrong ones and the perpetrators.

This is a kind of weird one. This is in Washington DC, a memorial to all victims of Communism that was recently established. And what I think of...when you look at this as a bigger project, it involves a website and a very active website, and the narrative on the website is all about the victory in the Cold War, you know, the end of Communism. It's a kind of a triumphalist message while at the same time talking about Communist victims.

And this Mengistu's Ethiopia. And now one wonders an image like this...Mengistu, as people know is one of the worst ever, one of the most terrible rulers in human history perhaps. Like the Khmer Rouge, millions of people died in Ethiopia under the rule of Mengistu. He is living now in Zimbabwe by the way completely unaccountable for these crimes but nonetheless these images of his quote, unquote rise to power you know remain in Addis Ababa in Ethiopia and one wonders how the victims engage with these kinds of images. Okay so let's now talk about some new forms of memory, some new forms of memory work, some new narratives that are emerging and I'm just going to give a few examples and then you know, more or less I'll stop soon and we can have some comments or questions. This is in downtown Beirut, Lebanon. And the idea here, which was never realized unfortunately because of the Israeli invasion of Lebanon shortly thereafter, this was about 2004, and this is on the green-line. The idea here was to take this building and turn it into a museum and the purpose of this museum was to...would be to commemorate all victims of the Lebanese 30 year conflict without referring to the religious affiliation or ethnic affiliation of any of the victims. So the notion here that was generated by a group called memoire de l'avenir, memory for the future, and a woman named Amal McCharem if people know who she is in the Lebanese context. They had this idea that all victims were actually equal as victims. That all victims had experienced the same terrible experiences and that one purpose of a museum like this would be to contribute to a future articulation of Lebanese identity that would understand that victims had experienced similar experiences. So the idea here was to bring this discussion of memory down to a level of basic humanity, what it means to be a human being, not to belong to a particular group.

I think this is fascinating. This is a... I mentioned before the gendered nature of the memory landscape. Think about how often you see images of women and women's lives in the memory scape. You don't so often. So this is an interesting counter-example. This is a memorial to World War II. This is built in the single most important commemorative space in the United Kingdom right in front of 10 Downing Street, White Hall, right next to the Cenotaph, which is the great World War I memorial, and it's supposed to represent the different experiences of women during World War II. So one question is when was this built? It was not built in 1945, 1947, 1948 this was built very recently, 2003 and it was built because of a recognition that this was an absence, there was an absence of stories about women in British history on the memory scape and those stories needed to be told. So this is part of the inclusive nature of this new paradigm to say actually we need to tell other stories.

We need to tell stories of different kinds of heroes for example...of rescuers.' There's a project... I don't have a slide of this...there's a project in Rwanda that is all about rescuers, people who came...Hutus who risked

their lives to save Tutsis. So there is a commemorative project about those experiences.

And this is the pedagogical side. This is a former torture survivor, former torture victim in Santiago, Chile at a former torture center...it's called Villa Grimaldi, it's a very, very powerful site and the guides, the people who take you around are former torture survivors. And for them, for this gentleman, for many of the people, and we can talk about this because it's an interesting topic, for these people there are a few things going on: one of the things is that they are teaching the future generation but another thing is that they are also processing their own experience and for some of the people that I talked to that do this, this has saved their lives actually. I have one friend, Pedro Mata is his name, not this gentleman, who is really a destroyed...destroyed by the experience of torture and it wasn't until Villa Grimaldi emerged as a site and he began to give tours at the site that he began to recuperate his life and this is a very important part of his own personal recovery so there are a few different things going on here. These are Latin American graduate students from the region who are visiting this site but this also raises questions of tourism, which I'm not addressing today - I have a whole separate set of slides about tourism and these sites. It's something we can talk about if we want to because obviously the intersection of sacred sites and tourism is a complicated question. This is... This doesn't strike me as so controversial because these are very interested, engaged graduate students but what happens when you get tourists wearing tank-tops and bathing suits and they're coming with their cameras on buses? Is that a positive or negative form of memory engagement? We can talk.

This is one of my favorite projects in the District 6 museum in South Africa. Highly interactive map...this is a neighborhood which was destroyed...so the entire neighborhood was destroyed... the neighborhood is no longer there. So they've created a map and asked people to come in and write on the map where they lived, where their house was, where their father's house was, where their grandparents' house was, where their grandparents' favorite nightclub was and to tell the story of those places and to engage with memory in this very constructive way about healing and remembering and sort of recovering from this but also about the power of history and memory.

Because of the topic of this particular event I wanted to reflect a little bit on how one commemorates missing people. There is an artistic trend that is emerging globally which is...this is in the world of commemorative arts, that is pushing towards...away from representation and towards representing absence. So I'm not sure if that's clear. The idea is that part of the classic art form is you try and recreate physical appearances. So you have for example in Washington DC there are two Vietnam memorials, one is abstract and one is representational. The representational one is a statue of three men but more and more artists are moving towards representing absence so let me give you just two or three examples.

This is a memorial to three teachers who were disappeared, they are known as los goyanos which means the people whose throats were cut. These three school teachers disappeared in Chile during the dictatorship. Like the other slide I showed their bodies were dumped in a field and these three chairs, these empty chairs, represent their absence. I find this a very powerful one because when one passes it one asks questions, you don't...this doesn't provide answers, it asks questions which is another, I think, wonderful idea behind this new memory paradigm is to ask questions. How could we do this? Why did this happen? What happened here? And that's what happens when you pass this. You pass this and you say 'who should be sitting in those chairs? What happened here?'

This is a different kind of absence this is absence of books. But again the idea of representing absence...it's hard to get a sense...the cobblestones are the size of normal cobblestones. This is Humboldt University in Berlin maybe some of you have walked by this. At that square at Humboldt University the Nazis had piled-up and burned books. So to represent the absence of those books you have this wonderful, I think, very beautiful underground memorial.

And this again in Santiago, Chile is a memorial to the disappeared. You can see the unfilled tombs. So you see the filled tombs on the left-hand side of that picture and the unfilled tombs on the right-hand side of that picture meant to be filled one day. And I know we seen this kind of imagery in this region as well. Okay I'd like to talk a little about the idea...let me just do a time check...I've been talking for about half-an-hour I think so I have until 10:30? Okay. I'm going to wrap up soon.

There is a theorist that I really like named James Young [who] has an interesting theory about memory and the formation of memory through memorials. And his theory is that once you build a memorial you start forgetting. It's an interesting idea. Most of the people who put energy into building memorials do it because they think this is about remembering, right? So it's a contradiction if he's right, that basically what begins to happen once you create the memorial is forgetting. So...in some ways if you think about this, this resonates, this makes sense because if you think about all the invisible statues you've seen in your life or not seen. If you walk down the streets in many, many places you pass maybe by statues and gravestones and all sorts of things- there is a small Jewish cemetery in New York near the university where I teach I pass-by a million times I never noticed it until I was talking about it in a class. I was talking about this question in a class and somebody said 'do you know about the Jewish cemetery outside?' And I looked out the window and there was this little Jewish cemetery I had never noticed before so James Young's point is if that is true, if you really start forgetting and memorials actually start to become invisible after they're created, what he said is that the most important part of memory is before you create, it's the process. Now James Young was a judge on the jury at the Berlin memorial...for the Berlin memorial to the murdered Jews in Europe and he was also a judge on the jury for the ground zero...so called ground zero/world trade center memorial in New York. And what he says is that you want to focus on the process of the design competition, the discussion about memory, you want to have forums and seminars, you want to have architects coming to a place like this and saying 'this is my vision of how we should remember this place.' You want to have all of that...it's that process and that discussion. So he points to the most successful memorial in his view in Germany, in Berlin. This was setup as a temporary exhibit. It's at the Nazi headquarters, at the...I'm sorry what's it called...the Gestapo headquarters in Berlin and there was a debate in Berlin 'what should we do about the Gestapo headquarters.' And nobody had a good idea so they said 'until we decide what to do let's put up a temporary exhibit.' And in the temporary exhibit we'll even ask 'how should we remember this place?' So they did and that temporary exhibit lasted for 10 years or 12 years and now it's a permanent exhibit which is not good from James Young's point of view. But when it was a temporary exhibit it was engaging, active, you can see its made of wood, there are pictures tacked up on the wall. It's not polished, fancy, expensive...none of those things. It's a temporary exhibit and people would come to this temporary exhibit and they'd say 'this is really interesting I wonder what we should do with a Gestapo headquarters.' So they'd be asking themselves those questions and be talking to their friends and they'd become participants in the construction of memory. So this is a great success story for James Young. Let me just give a couple of other examples. In Morocco, there was a truth commission in Morocco that identified 13 former torture centers. This is one of the former torture centers in the back of this beautiful building there was a courtyard and the courtyard was used as a clandestine prison camp during the so-called 'years of lead' in the 1970s. So the truth commission identified 13 of these and for one reason or another, 11 of them they recommended that they be turned into 'site de memoire historique,' sites of historical memory. And so what's happening now in this site- I'll give you another image of the same site- these were bodies that were in a mass grave outside near that building. They were killed in the building during torture, etc. and their bodies were dumped here. And these markers were actually put up by the truth commission so in each of these cases there is a government office, it's called the CCDH, the Conseil Consultatif des Droits de l'Homme, the Consultative Office of Human Rights. And what they've done is they got a nice grant to do this and they are setting up consultative meetings in each of these towns to discuss what to do with these buildings and how to turn them into site de memoire historique. So they're having this discussion with stakeholders, with others and they're very vibrant discussions because some people want to turn these into libraries, into clinics, schools but, they can do that and they probably will, they also want to be able to think of a way to turn these into memory sites, museums, spaces etc. to learn about and think about torture practices during the 1970s.

Same space here. I wanted to give you just...maybe this is as good of a place as any to end I have a few more but maybe I'll end with this one...no I'll end with the one after this.

This is actually one of my number one favorite memorials of all time. And it might surprise you because it's not made of stone, it's made of cloth. This is a little different. This is about HIV/AIDS so it's not about crimes against humanity in the classic sense. This is a project in which the family of someone who died of HIV/AIDS, regardless of the reason, regardless of you know the way they contracted the disease, were asked to create a small piece of textile, small piece of cloth commemorating that person and they were asked to do it in their own way with whatever images they wanted. And so each of these squares actually contains...yes I think each of these is actually one person so this square would be one person...(inaudible)... but if you take all this together

and you lay it out on the ground you get this. Now this is an incredibly powerful thing and many people have said-if you look at the literature on the HIV movement in the United States-this is one of the most important moments because of its consciousness raising ability, because of its ability to create a dialogue about HIV/AIDS in the United States. So this was part of a social movement. It was aimed at the future, it was aimed at preventing HIV/AIDS, at stopping the problem and it did it through this very beautiful, creative mechanism and it's not permanent. I mean if we go deeper into this topic I'll... I don't like permanent memorials personally. I don't like stone permanent memorials because I think they do become invisible in the next generation. I think it's very hard to maintain memory inter-generationally unless you're very creative. I actually think that this, made of cloth, is more likely to impress the next generation than a big stone slab. And the reason is that this is now in storage and in every 10 or 15 years they bring it out and in every 10 or 15 years they create a new dialogue in American society about HIV AIDS. I think there is an NGO associated with it that's about prevention so I think it's a very interesting example.

Another one of my favorite examples is Pine in Chile. This was a village, a town, small town that was badly affected by the dictatorship. There were about 75 victims in this town so a group of historians. I'm sorry a group of artists went to the town, graduate students, and they said to the families 'what can we do to remember this process' and the family said 'we don't know we have some ideas' and this conversation between the artists and the family members went on for a year or two years and during that time they decided they would make mosaics. And so the artists taught the family members how to make mosaics and altogether they sat down and every day they designed their own mosaic forms and they ended coming up with each one of them a mosaic form for their own loved one which, again, in this very process-oriented one or two year long period in which they were also talking with newspapers there was a film made about this that was also distributed in Chilean society. And overall I think it had the result of being a highly process-oriented and interesting way of telling memory and these mosaic forms ends up commemorating each individual victim but taken together they actually create another form of mosaic as all taken together. So, let me end there and I'll open it up to comments or questions and I'll take it from there. Does that sound good? Mr. Chair.

Gabriella Citroni, University of Milan

Thank you very much and let me thank also for inviting me because it's a pleasure and an honor for me to be here today and I'm sorry that I couldn't be here this morning I infer I lost some interesting and also the presentation this afternoon but the flights were delayed so partly it's not my fault but I was briefly updated on what was inferred this morning and I'll also try my best to add a bit. To this topic which I think and I can hear from the very vivid debate is of the utmost importance in all societies. I know from this morning you have been listening to examples coming from other countries. I will also bring examples coming from other continents, in particular, Latin America because its where my experience basically lies and I also think it's interesting because in Latin America we can also see some huge, I would say, successes but also we can still see a lot of dilemmas underlining the whole debate of memory memorialization and problems, maybe in countries which passed the conflict or dictatorship, whatever you call it in the country, 30 years ago. This is to say that this is a difficult topic even 30 years after the war. And I think we should keep this in mind when we deal with this subject. Maybe, and I have to say my background is legal, I am lawyer, and therefore when I deal with memory it would seem to be less controversial but it's far from the truth. This is highly controversial and I also think we have to keep in mind it is deeply intertwined with justice, truth, and reparation. I just want to make the point here, in any country that goes through conflict, dictatorship, violence you have always this for rights, obligations...they will never come all together. I know no country all over the world where after a period of violence you immediately get truth, justice, and reparation, and memory all together...let's forget about it. They might come at a different pace at a different stage with a difficult path but we have to keep in mind all of them. Because we have to remember in many other countries the solution of buying memory through reparation or buying justice through memory has been put forward. We have to be cautious about this. Memory is not here to substitute justice and I've been hearing this as a need here. No way. Memory cannot come to substitute justice. Sometimes memory can be ordered as a means to obtaining justice and now I try to explain myself. There are many countries which have gone through wars or dictatorships that afterwards have gone through transitional justice mechanisms like the peace and reconciliation commissions. And today I would like to focus in particular on Peru. In many cases these mechanisms have triggered a whole debate on memory and have led

to the state adopting measures of memory preservation, memory memorialization. Does this work? We'll see. But our other cases where memory or building memorials has been ordered by tribunals, namely in Latin America, it's very much the case with the inter-American court of human rights. Does this work? Sometimes it works sometimes it doesn't and often, and this I'd like to point out now, in particular the inter-American court of human rights orders the building of memorials together with issuing apologies to victims.

Does ordering the issuing of apologies work or not? Can this be ordered? Does this work with states? Is it genuine? Does this bring the results we are looking for? To be discussed...but anyway I'm just throwing out questions now and I'll try to provide provisional answers, in particular because there is no receipt unfortunately. Another thing that I would like to say...and now I'd like to show some pictures. I know you've quite a few already this morning and I could pick it up here. There are different kinds of memory initiatives in general. We can discuss about memorials. We can discuss about sites of conscience, monuments, plaques, but there is also a whole subject, which I don't know if it has been touched or not, performances related to memory like street theatre, or initiatives that come mainly from the civil society. Because in this we have to remember that there are different options. Memory can come from above. I can come from the truth commission, from a court or tribunal...memory can come from a law which is, again, from the above. But also memory can come from the bottom, which is civil society. Sometimes we can just combine it which to me, and this is the first answer I would say, proves to be the most effective combination. There is no example of memory only coming from above through a law or through an order of a court or through a recommendation of the truth commission that works. Why? Because of course victims will always say, in particular victims, 'we feel excluded. Whose memory is this? It's not my memory. Who are you to state, the court or the truth commission, to tell me my story?' And I think this we have to keep in mind. Whatever strategy we want to introduce, it's impossible to introduce only from the outside or above. It's a process that has to go by hand. But we have to remember that art and performances can be of a huge importance in the whole process. This is one of the most famous paintings of a Colombian artist, Botero, and this is about a massacre. I think Colombia is a very interesting example. Colombia has an ongoing conflict so we have to keep this in mind. When do we start building memory? The word memory means 'I remember something that has happened in the past.' Can we build memory while something is happening? In Columbia they've been forced to because the conflict has been ongoing for the last 40 years. So if they wait I think it might be maybe too late.

This comes from Paraguay and again it's an art work, Oscar Solerno is the artist, and he used to show these art works during the dictatorship in Paraguay which was also quite dangerous for him but it was quite influential in producing some results. In keeping the living memory of the society alive while the very violations were taking place.

This is from Colombia and this is a typical example of street, or memory, performance. This is in Medellin and this has been quite impressive because, I don't know how familiar you are with the conflict in Columbia, but beside the state and the guerrillas there are paramilitaries which maybe are the most effective in committing crimes still at present. Where do you denounce them when they basically live next to you, which is a problem that is quite common throughout the world. With a street performance pronounced right in the middle of town which was quite strong, you can see bodies lying on the floor, in a city like Medellin which is quite used, unfortunately, to street violence, how do we still make the point and, in particular, how do we reach out to new generations? And this is the thing I would like to bring on the table. Memory is for those who lived through violations, they are for those who remember. Memory is for us living now to keep in mind what happened. But memory is in particular for the future...the future generations. So if you want to have good answers you have to ask good questions. So the question, I think, would be what story do we want to tell to the next generation? And how do we want to get them involved? Because, in many cases, the immediate answer of the next generation would be 'I don't want to hear any more about violence, about war...forget about that. I'm a new person, I come from a new country. I don't want to listen to your stories.' Sometimes it's tempting. It's the shortcut, we close it and that's it. Otherwise it could be like opening Pandora's Box. But I don't know if this has been pointed out this morning...what's memory for? Reparation? Of course. Satisfaction, restitution of dignity? Of course. But memory is also a lot about prevention. We can't consider memory has only a measure of reparation. Of course this is for the past or for those who are living but what about the future? A country who forgets its past is not able to build a different future that's for sure. Just telling a story to new generations...is this enough? Not really. How do we get them involved? How do we get them creative? Performances are one of

the best answers because they used the language of the new generation, the language of creativity. Using art to convey a message is quite effective.

This is in Argentina which is a country which maybe succeeded the most in getting memory as I think one of the passwords in the country. Memory is all around; memory is the government and memory is the people. But this is precisely what I was speaking of when I said this could take thirty years. ESMA, the former torture center in Buenos Aires was there and was reminding every single Argentinian of the horror of the past 30 years. It was only until 2006, which was eventually the precedent, genuinely said 'I'm sorry. I regret what happened. And this is to become a place for memory.' And after that this has not been far from controversy. Because afterwards there are many questions. Who is going to run the place of memory? Who is going to decide to remember? Do we use it as it used to be? Will this remind us of the horror that took place there or do we build something different? And this is a question which is very present I would say. Luckily enough I have never been tortured but I think that if I'd been tortured I would hate to see the place where I've been tortured. I would like to see it destroyed. Maybe this is an instinct. But then I would ask myself what is the point in destroying it? It's just for me...what about the future? If I destroy it, afterwards nobody will remember what happened to me. This can happen again.

This again comes from Argentina and it's a performative work of memory and you would find it in Buenos Aires and other cities in Argentina. Right in the place where people were deprived of their liberty they just hang a sign with the name of the person who was disappeared. And this gives a physical impression of what disappearance is. Because we can say that after the war in Bosnia there were 30,000 disappeared people. You know it's a huge number, the same number which there was in Argentina. But if you just use number this is mathematics of horror. Just think of one single person and the physical space which one person takes. Otherwise this doesn't mean anything. And this is also very common in Argentina: to put messages on the street. Why? Because if we just build a monument, we can just get used to it. One day it happened to me in a small village where I live. I was passing through a monument which has been there...I grew up always seeing the same monument...and my daughter asked me 'what is the monument for?' And I was like...I know it is for someone who died during the war and I was so ashamed that I didn't even know if it was World War I or II. I mean I just knew it was something to do with a war. Why, because I've been seeing this monument every day of my life and I really didn't care. This is the answer that I gave in response to Argentina putting things in the street or sometimes they put something called baldosa, which are small rocks that you have to watch otherwise you just fall down in the street so you are forced to realize that it's on the street.

This other example comes from Guatemala and this is again performative, quite strong art performance. She is an artist in Guatemala and I don't know if you're familiar but Guatemala had one of the highest numbers of forced disappearances, 45,000 people. So she went to the main square in Guatemala City, this is blood what you see. She just stepped all over the place leaving all of the prints to say that you can't just erase the past and erase blood. It's something very, very powerful but it worked. Performative works are also t-shirts. The idea of wearing your memory, and doing it in the daily life. Does this work? Usually yes, in particular in getting involved in new generations because they would look at you t-shirt and ask you what is that? And so you have to tell the story.

This is a very clever way they use in Chile during the dictatorship. This was a comics, and it was of course against Pinochet but as it couldn't be said openly they used a reochio, which was a comics, to denounce what was going on. So this is also memory. I know this morning you've been seeing a lot. This is recent in Chile...this is ESMA, this is just an example I wanted to point out. This could perfectly be a memorial. This is in Uruguay and today it's a wonderful shopping mall called Ponte Corretas. This used to be a jail where people and political detainees were brought. Immediately after the difficult years it was decided to be commuted into a nice shopping mall and today people go there and just shop. Is this memory? For people who studied this subject this is a tremendously interesting subject and if you want I can also tell you that the architects also referred to Piranezi's prints which remind to the idea of a jail. But basically it's a mall. People go there to have a coffee and to shop. There is nothing left of the jail. Do we prefer this? Do we prefer to wipe out totally what happened? This could be a message. We just want to go on. Is this possible that way? I don't know.

This is Argentina and I won't use this and this is Brazil and this is an interesting monument I'd just like to

mention briefly because it collects the idea of being a monument for the present but also for the future. It was born for the torture that happened in the past but now it is used for all manifestations, for everything that is related to human rights which is an interesting example of how you can build something for maybe a specific purpose, denouncing torture, but it can actually become a different message for future generations. Its protection of human rights in general.

And this is an example in El Salvador which I wanted to point out. El Salvador after 12 years had a truth commission. One of the recommendations of the truth commission was to build a monument in memory of all the victims of the conflict. And that was 1994. Nothing happened. The government took the recommendations and said 'thank you very much to the truth commission' and that's it. Relatives of the victims of the war tried to obtain from the government what was recommended by the truth commission but that was to no use. So they decided to create something which was called Committee Parlamento which is a committee in favor of a monument which is basically an association formed by civil society. And that way they eventually managed to collect the money. Initially they didn't get a single penny from the government, maybe from international cooperation, but nothing from El Salvador. And eventually they built the monument. This was a huge victory of the civil society but this also must be put in context in the meantime the political context in El Salvador changed and this takes time. This year, the new president, one of the first speeches he gave he went to this monument, which was a huge acknowledgement of what the civil society had done. Publicly recognized the responsibility of the government, and without the recommendation or orders, and said that now the government will take over and cooperate with the committee. Interestingly enough the name was committee for the monument so you would say after the monument is built they're done there is no need for them anymore. They didn't want to change their name. They still exist. Why? Because they said memory is not about a monument. This will be useless and senseless. Memory is about living this monument, bringing here school children, bringing here tourists, telling this story and making this memory lively. Is this succeeding? In El Salvador actually it is working quite well.

I will bring you another example for El Salvador trying to answer another question I asked at the beginning which is related to an order which was issued by the inter-American court of human rights. A case of disappearance occurred in 1982 was brought to the inter-American court of human rights and the inter-American court of human rights eventually said the state is responsible for this because they army disappeared these two children. Within all the different majors of this operation the court ordered the state to issue a public apology to the victims, to the families of these two girls. Did the state do so? There was a ceremony. The family of the two girls was there. Not the highest authorities of the country, maybe some sub-sub-sub ministry was there and the person never actually said 'I beg your pardon.' He said 'I regret what happened to these two girls. I regret a lot of things but I'm not begging pardon.' This is totally different and this was offending the family of the two girls providing measures of reparation. I know that today we will also deal with apologies. I don't know if apologies ordered from the above can work if they are not genuine. Because there are also these ways to escape...this is the same monument in El Salvador.

This is from Guatemala. And this is, on the contrary, a case where apparently it works the cooperation between an international court and civil society. This is a church in a very small village in the center of Guatemala which was built after a massacre was committed here in 1982. The families of those massacred built this little church and it's quite impressive because there were more than 269 people massacred in one day. So you enter this very small church and you have all the names of the people which is impressive but it's in a tremendously small village. And when I say small I mean four houses. So basically that was built in advance. The case got to the inter-American court and the inter-American court recognized this as a reparation by itself but ordered the state to pay for the maintenance of this place. It worked and it is considered by the people there one of the most effective tools for remembering but also for pursuing the struggle for justice.

Now, very quickly on Peru. Peru had a conflict which lasted from 1980 to 2000. In 2000 they decided to have a peace and reconciliation commission which worked until 2003. It's an interesting example because when the truth commission started to work they figured out that the number of people dead during the conflict were 35,000. After three years researching they discovered that actually it was double. It was 70,000 people dead plus 15,000 disappeared. So they knew that the release of their report was going to create some impact. What they decided to do was to start a bit before the release of their final report with a picture exhibition which was

called yuyana pac, which means not to forget. And that was quite strong. That was a first message to the whole society. Afterwards the report was released. The El Hogejora, and I know you spoke about this this morning and you'll see some pictures. This is El Hogejora, this memorial which is the mother earth crying for all the people who died, was built. It's quite controversial; someone criticized the fact that it was designed by a foreigner, actually a foreigner who has been living in Peru for the last 20 years, but still, a foreigner. And it's a place where you find names of victims and perpetrators together. Was this a success? Was this a failure?

Well, El Hogejora, was treated like this at least three times. Well. To those who are not familiar with Peru. It's not by coincidence that they used orange paint because this is the color of the party of the former dictator. So it is actually used to convey a message. When supporters of the former dictator want to convey a message, which is their support for the former dictator, they go there. Every 28th of August, which is the celebration of issuing the report, they go there and there are accidents. I'm not saying it's good but if we want to measure the success of the initiative, well, apparently it has some success because otherwise people wouldn't choose to attack it. At the same time I have to point out one thing. If you speak about this with any person involved with this in Peru on the whole subject they will have their opinion. If you just catch a taxi in Lima and said 'please bring me to El Hogejora' many times the taxi driver ignores where it is. What does this mean? That sometimes we have to take in mind that memorials shouldn't be only for those directly affected, for the international community, for experts, or for artists. They are for common people and if the taxi driver is not familiar with this there is a problem. Last time I went there and I knew where it was and what it was about I asked a person working there 'do you know what it is about?' and he said 'you know those modern artists' and that was it. Which means well maybe average and common people are not reached by these initiatives and on top of that, maybe this is not that pertinent for the case of Bosnia, but maybe we should also ask where should we put or build these things? This is in Lima. The highest number of violations were committed in other places in Peru and people who were touched by violence will never ever get to see this. Is this their memorial, their memory? This is also what has been done to the memorial and I know that this morning you have been discussing about the problems with the El Hogejora, about inscribing names of perpetrators and order coming from an outsider, the inter-American court, to inscribe names. This is highly controversial and I think that if you want to...okay I will explain because all over the place there are these stones with names inscribed. Eventually one case of major violations was brought to the inter-American court of human rights and the whole story is quite peculiar... I have still some minutes...because the representatives of the victims requested as a measure of reparation to have a memorial built for them apart from this. So they had a different request but the state itself said no way, you already have El Hogejora so if you want the names of the victims on the memorial it must be there. So the court said ok, if the state agrees, this will be my order. And the court ordered Peru to inscribe the name of the 41 victims of this huge massacre in a jail on El Hogejora. Until that day, everything was perfect but after this they discovered that some of the names were actually names of people, some convicted of terrorism, some accused of terrorism, were already there. The artist herself was shocked. She said that I didn't know that the name of terrorists were there. I don't want them to be there. I mean those names had been there over the past three years with no problem whatsoever. After the order of the court came there was a huge scandal. In Peru it was purposed to destroy the monument. The artist said 'I don't want those names, I will keep them out' which from a little point of view is quite troubling because this would mean that Peru doesn't comply with their obligation, which is an order coming from an international court. What do we do? So Peru, to gain time, went back to the inter-American court and requested a judgment of interpretation, which is quite silly because there is nothing to interpret this I mean, 'inscribe 41 names' is quite clear. So the representatives of the victims said 'we set this, we want our memorial. We don't want to create any problem for this memorial.' It's the court that ordered it to be put there. So the court eventually said 'ok, so you want another memorial? Just have another memorial.' To be honest I just don't see this new memorial coming because there is no way that the state is going to build a specific memorial in memory of 41 terrorists. But still we have a problem. What will happen if the state doesn't comply?

This is an example which I think could be pertinent. It's one of the not well known memorials in Peru but if you go to it today in Lima you won't see it because the mayor of the municipality adopted a decree overnight which led to the immediate destruction of the memorial. It's interesting because I've been listening here that there are examples here where initiatives are taken. Mayors or the authorities decide to stop these initiatives. What happened after this? There was quite an important scandal and now the mayor is being investigated by a court in Lima and he has been ordered to rebuild this. We might ask ourselves if rebuilding has the same

meaning. If it's ok and if memory didn't already change in between. But this is an example.

The last example I wanted to bring is something which is a huge debate right now in Peru. Three years ago Angela Merkel visited Peru, got acquainted with what had happened to Peru, and offered two million dollars to build a museum of memory. She said 'in Germany we now what the problem is with memories.' Incredibly the president of Peru said no thank you. I mean who says no to two million dollars? He has his reasons for saying no because he was quite involved in the violations but this created a huge reaction of the civil society who said no way were going to say no to two million dollars. So the day after, and this is quite common for politicians, he accepted. They created a commission to decide where to build the museum. We should consider that this museum will be in Lima, again, the capital far away from the places where violations took place. Who are in the committee to decide about the site of the museum? There was no single representative of victims of violence. Whose memory will this be? Will this be a success? Now this is the president who said no to the two million dollars a few days ago putting the first stone down of the museum, which should be completed by the end of June 2011. Now we know what it will look like and where it will be but we don't know what will be inside of it. Who decided? A committee made up of artists, academics, and cultural leaders. Can this be memory? Is this going to bring results?

Let me conclude very briefly with one short story which explains my whole point of this question. This is a picture that has become tremendously famous in Peru and this was in a pictures exhibition which was shown immediately before the truth commission delivered its report. If you visited the exhibition you would see that this person was called a Cellentino Sente, a victim of terrorist violence. This picture became a symbol through Peru, in the States, all over the world. This picture became the symbol of violence in Peru. Well 20 years afterwards the photographer decided to go and look for the person who was a survivor of a massacre and he went to the village and asked for Cellentino Sente and all the people said this isn't Cellentino Sente. This person is Edmundo Camonsumari. So he went and looked and eventually he said yes this person is called Edmundo Camonsumari. He lived in a place completely far away from the capital. He didn't even know of the existence of the truth commission. He didn't know that his picture was famous. The perpetrators of the massacre had not been judged and he didn't get any reparations. He was completely out of the picture while being the face of violence in Peru. So here we see this person was Edmundo Camana. This person was used a second time politically. Politicians said 'you see he has been forgotten, the truth commission didn't work, and there wasn't transitional justice. Now we have to do something for him.' So they took him, because he was half-paralyzed, from the small village where he was living and they brought him to Lima. Unfortunately three days afterwards he died in the hospital in Lima. He died in the hospital with his real name but completely out of the transitional justice process, completely out of memory, completely out of justice, completely out of truth and reparation. This is, I think, my main message. If we don't put victims at the center and at the core of the whole process of memory this is not going to work. We can't have truth, we can't have justice, we can't have reparation, and we can't have a genuine memory if we don't start from this. Thank you.