

Report:

Memorializing Missing Persons in the Western Balkans: Challenges and Perspectives

Distribution:
General
Sarajevo, 5 March 2012
ICMP.JCSI.94.3.doc

I. Executive summary

1. Countries of the Western Balkans have begun to engage in a process of remembrance and universal memorialization of missing persons. The International Commission on Missing Persons (ICMP) is facilitating dialogue on memorials and commemoration with associations of families of missing persons and other civil society groups in the region. To date, ICMP has facilitated two international conferences and a series of low-key consultations with associations of families of missing persons on memorialization and commemoration. Although there is recognition of the important role memorialization has in terms of paying tribute to the victims and fostering a culture of human rights and a climate in which the crimes committed in the past will never again be repeated, it has become apparent that a number of challenges must be addressed to realize a holistic approach to memorialization.
2. Widespread interest in memorials and remembrance exists amongst civil society participants, not least associations of families of missing persons, who have established and expanded on the goals and principles that should guide memorialization processes through a series of consultations facilitated by ICMP. These consultations provided constructive insights on memorialization and the challenges in seeking to develop a universal approach to memorializing missing persons in the Western Balkans.
3. Although coming to know the fate of missing relatives is the foremost priority for associations of families of missing persons, ICMP notes the potential for memorialization to assist and strengthen the missing persons process cannot be overstated. Rather than drawing a line under the missing persons process, a societal dialogue about how we pay tribute to missing persons – through the development of appropriate memorials and days of commemoration – may actually invigorate the process by keeping the issue of missing persons firmly within the public eye. In this way, a societal dialogue on how the countries of the region might best pay tribute to missing persons irrespective of national, ethnic or religious belonging can only serve to bring the issue of missing persons from the margins to a occupy a more prominent space in public policy. And this can only have a beneficial impact on the actual process of locating, recovering and identifying missing persons. Further, memorialization of missing persons is important for the simple fact that it is unlikely that all missing persons from across the region will be found. A universal memorial to the missing would therefore be an appropriate form of commemoration and for many would serve as the only form of testament to their existence.
4. The ICMP-facilitated consultations also revealed that there is a lack of consensus surrounding the issue of who should be memorialized. Drawing a distinction between combatants and civilians is problematic and incorporates an array of meta-conflicts yet it remains of fundamental importance to some groups. Furthermore, the issue of whether a proposed memorial should be dedicated exclusively to missing persons was raised in light of the cathartic properties it might hold for relatives still seeking answers. Although no concrete solutions emerged, instigating discussion and dialogue on these contentious matters was valuable and additional in-depth consultations will likely lead to the emergence of more moderate viewpoints and timely progression.
5. The consultation process also generated ideas and opinions on potential locations for a universal memorial. Divergent views were evident as regards the possibility of adopting a universal approach to memorialization in the region and also in relation to whether any memorial should be located centrally or replicated in various cities throughout the region. The issue of inscribing the names of victims on any memorial also gave rise to differences of opinion amongst the associations of families of missing persons. The positives and negatives of memorials being inscribed were extensively debated and it is arguable that irrespective of whether inscription occurs, there is a growing impetus for the creation of an accurate regional database that comprehensively compiles the names of all missing persons in the Western Balkans. Such a database, accessible online, would itself be a form of universal memorial.
6. The process of memorializing missing persons in the Western Balkans is a complex one, characterized by unique regional challenges and divergent perspectives. While recognizing the challenges that lie ahead, ICMP believes that developing a universal memorial is a crucial component of transitional

justice and represents an important step towards reconciliation and a lasting peace in the region. Civil Society organizations and key stakeholders have demonstrated a keen interest in engaging in such a process and understand the potential dividends that could be reaped by remembering the past to forge a brighter future. However, the proposal to memorialize missing persons is still in its infancy and therefore ICMP recommends expanding the consultation process and facilitating further workshops at a local and regional level. Youth involvement is also a key priority and to that end, future discussions and projects should seek to encourage the participation of multi-ethnic youth organizations in order to strengthen the memorialization process.

II. Introduction

7. The armed conflicts in the former Yugoslavia in the 1990s were characterized by mass atrocity and egregious systemic violations of human rights. Following the cessation of conflicts in the former Yugoslavia, there were 40,000 persons missing and presumed dead. This number includes the conflicts in Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH), and Kosovo as well as the 2001 crisis in Macedonia. Of the approximately 40,000 persons missing in the region, an estimated 30,000 were missing from the BiH conflict, 5,500 from the Croatia conflicts, 4,500 from the Kosovo conflict and 23 persons from the 2001 crisis in Macedonia. Today the regional number of missing persons is approximately 14,000, of whom approximately 10,000 are missing from the BiH conflict, 2,000 from the Croatia conflict, 1,900 from the Kosovo conflict and 13 from Macedonia.
8. ICMP has worked closely with the Governments of BiH, the Republic of Croatia, the Republic of Serbia, Montenegro and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, as well as with the authorities in Kosovo to locate, recover and identify 26,000 missing persons – two thirds of the total number of missing persons. In terms of technical assistance, ICMP has assisted in making 16,294 identifications of different individuals since the DNA labs went on line in November 2001.
9. Alongside its technical assistance to establish the identity of missing persons, ICMP is facilitating a consultation process with associations of families of missing persons from the countries concerned to explore perspectives for the development of universal memorials that will pay tribute to all missing persons irrespective of national, ethnic or religious origin.
10. Recognizing the pivotal importance of victims groups in any transitional justice process, ICMP together with UNDP opened a debate among associations of families of missing persons and civil society from across the Western Balkans on post-conflict memorialization in December 2010, with the international conference titled *Promoting a Holistic Approach to Memorials and Remembrance*. In May 2011, ICMP together with the International Coalition of Sites of Conscience (ICSC) gathered associations of families of missing persons from BiH, Croatia and Serbia at a two-day conference on *the Missing, Memory and Sites of Conscience*.
11. The conclusions of the *Promoting a Holistic Approach to Memorials and Remembrance* conference indicate a growing interest in memorials and remembrance, with multiple proposals as to how the victims should be remembered. The discussion revealed however that obstacles must be overcome in order 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. Consensus exists that memorials should not offend. Yet, several interlocutors suggested that memorials should not only pay tribute to one's own victims, but also apportion blame to the perpetrators. Such an approach, however, is in collision with the principle of *do no harm*, which many of the consultation participants recognized as a key principle of memorialization. It was suggested that memorials are for future generations to remember, and to learn from and that they ought to be conceived and developed in such a way that they engage younger generations.

12. At the conference on *the Missing, Memory and Sites of Conscience*, associations of families of missing persons and other representatives of Civil Society Organizations developed, in dedicated working groups, a set of principles that should guide a process of memorialization and form the bedrock of a memorial to the victims of armed conflict. The principles determined at the conference comprise:
 - Memorials, and the process of their development, should take into consideration the wishes of victims and families of missing persons and reflect their needs;
 - Memorials should encourage dialogue; memorials are not the end of the story but the start;
 - Memorials should be open; they should not exclude certain groups or memories, but incorporate them so that all families of the missing feel a memorial addresses them but also speaks on their behalf;
 - Memorials should recognize victims equally and respectfully;
 - Memorials should be able to evolve over time so that they can continue to engage and convey the past to future generations;
 - Memorials must not offend and should adhere to the principle of *do no harm*.
13. Also at the conference, participants discussed the objectives of post-conflict memorialization. There was a sense that the objectives are to acknowledge and honor the victims, and to help future generations to remember the past and to learn from it so that the crimes committed in the past are never repeated in the future.
14. The conference also resulted in proposals for various joint memorials, such as a) a central regional memorial to all victims of war, b) identical memorials to all civilian victims of war from the former Yugoslavia located in various cities in the region, such as Zagreb, Sarajevo, Belgrade, and c) a joint memorial to all missing persons from the region.
15. Having identified objectives and principles of memorialization and having heard at least three proposals that share a common approach to commemorating victims jointly at the two international conferences, ICMP later facilitated a series of mono-ethnic low-key consultations with associations of families of missing persons and representatives of civil society organizations in order to test the extent to which the objectives, principles and proposals have purchase among Bosniak, Bosnian Croat, Bosnian Serb, Croatian and Serbian target groups when consulted individually, and to explore the extent to which the objectives, principles and proposals might be further developed.
16. ICMP facilitated a low-key consultation with Bosnian Croat associations of families of missing persons in Mostar on 13th June 2011; another with Bosnian Serb associations of families of missing persons in Doboï on 8th July 2011; another with Serb associations of families of missing persons (from both Croatia and Kosovo) in Belgrade on 13th July 2011, another with Croatian associations of families of missing persons in Slavonski Brod on July 14th 2011, and another with Bosniak associations of families of missing persons in Sarajevo on 20th September 2011.
17. This report seeks to highlight the principle conclusions to emerge from these low-key consultations on memorialization and to analyze the perspectives and challenges in developing a universal memorial to all missing persons in a post-conflict setting, such as the Western Balkans.

III. Needs and priorities

18. Victims needs change over time. At first victims often tend to want merely to know the circumstances of death or disappearance of a relative, and for their mortal remains to be located, recovered and identified so that they can be given a dignified burial. Later, victims often express a desire for justice: in a broader sense they want acknowledgement of their pain, suffering and loss not only by society but moreover by the authorities; from a narrower perspective they want to see war crime suspects to be prosecuted, to stand trial and to receive a befitting sentence if found guilty. They may also express a

legitimate wish for reparation, to repair the harm done to them, which may take various forms such as financial compensation, restitution of rights or property, psychological and/or social assistance as well as other symbolic forms of reparation such as official apologies, the establishment of days of commemoration or the raising of memorials.

19. For the families in the Western Balkans who are still searching for their missing relatives, the highest priority is knowing the truth, that is knowing the fate of a missing loved one, recovering and identifying their mortal remains and giving them a respectful burial with dignity. This primary need was a common theme of all low-key consultations with associations of families of missing persons.
20. In Slavonski Brod, Ivan Adzijević, of the Association of civilian victims of war Slavonski Brod, said, “What hurts me most is that I have still not found my missing relative, who disappeared 20 years ago. Let’s first deal with that and then we can talk about memorials...” In Belgrade, Nataša Ščepanović, of the Association of killed and missing from Kosovo and Metohija, said, “We have much bigger problems. The biggest problem is how to find our missing relatives and punish the perpetrators...” In Mostar, Sarafina Kolovrat, of the Association of families of killed and missing Croatian defenders Bugojno, said, “We appreciate the initiative of ICMP. But it is important that we find the remaining one third of the people who are missing. Even if we can’t find all of them, we need to find more.” In Sarajevo, Zio Smajilović, of the Mothers of Srebrenica and Žepa enclaves, said, “The prosecution of war crimes is imperative. When you achieve justice, then anything is possible. Then you can have as many memorials as there are trials.” In Doboj, Miodrag Zimonjić, of the Association of killed and missing soldiers and civilian of war Serbs of Brčko Municipality, said, “16 years ago my son disappeared. Since then I can’t sleep. I am not interested in memorials. I am not interested in war crime trials. Just give me the bones of my son so I can bury them.”
21. A number of participants expressed the conviction that only after the full range of transitional justice mechanisms have been employed and society has dealt with its past, can we begin to explore perspectives for the establishment of a memorial. In Doboj, Boro Peulić said, “First we need truth, justice and reconciliation, before we can speak about memorials...”
22. But if reconciliation is a prerequisite to raising a memorial, as suggested by Mr. Peulić, then that is to put the cart before the horse. It might be argued that the very development of a memorial – the process itself, involving different actors from across the one-time conflict divide – contributes to reconciliation. In this sense, the physical memorial should not be seen as purely an end in itself, a marker that peoples are reconciled. Rather, the process of developing a memorial might best be understood as a vehicle that enables communities to come together across the conflict divide to reflect in a multi-perspectival way about the past, about how societies and individuals might pay tribute to the victims, and in so doing contribute to building a sustainable peace.
23. Zvonimir Kubinek expressed views similar to those of Boro Peulić: “We support the establishment of a joint memorial to the missing ... but there are obstacles and we must overcome them... Many issues should be resolved: Bosnia and Herzegovina is divided – there is no unity. We are still influenced by emotions. A stable political climate is needed. Bosnia and Herzegovina must become a state of citizens, but after 20 years we have not created such a state. We need to find the missing and perpetrators are not prosecuted.”
24. These concerns are valid, but it should not be forgotten that memorials can do something that truth-seeking and criminal justice mechanisms cannot. While criminal justice is indeed of critical importance, the focus of any investigation, prosecution and trial is through due process to find the suspect guilty or innocent. That is to say the focus of a war crime trial is not the victim, but the suspect, or perpetrator if found guilty. Even when victim-survivors give testimony in war crime trials, their role in the trial is purely instrumental. Truth-seeking efforts, in contrast to war crime trials, do tend to focus on victims. Victim-centered truth commissions in many instances have collected victim testimonies in order to recover memory of a painful past and establish a narrative of patterns of past violations of human rights based on the victims’ stories. Such efforts, while they to an extent empower victims and

give them voice, fall short of truly paying tribute to the victims or explicitly acknowledging them and their pain and suffering.

25. In contrast to both truth commissions and criminal trials, memorials and commemoration deliver something that truth-seeking and trials simply cannot, and that is acknowledgement of the victims and the restoration of a measure of dignity. This is not to suggest that memorialization should take precedence over truth-seeking or trials, which are both critical elements of any comprehensive approach to address a legacy of past abuse, rather they serve different ends and each have limitations as to what they can and cannot achieve.
26. After periods of massive and systemic violations of human rights, victims have four principle rights: a right to truth, to justice, to reparation and to non-repetition. Conversely states are obliged to make a full and good-faith effort to fulfill all of these victims' rights. However states often perceive their obligations to the victims as an à la carte menu. And transitional justice mechanisms often tend to be implemented on the basis of what is possible from a legal, social and political perspective at a given moment in time. It would be fair to say, transitions and the mechanisms employed to deal with the legacy of past abuse are as much determined by the local context and conditions as they are by moral imperatives.
27. In the Western Balkans, all four of the transitional justice mechanisms (courts, truth-seeking bodies, reparations programs and institutional reform) have been employed to a greater or lesser extent by both state and non-state actors. The ICTY was first established in 1993 to try the most serious perpetrators of war crimes in the former Yugoslavia. During the last decade dedicated war crime chambers have been established in Belgrade, Sarajevo and Zagreb operating in parallel to the ICTY. At the same time, truth-seeking mechanisms have been implemented some with greater success than others. The ICMP's DNA-led process of identifications might best be seen as a means of truth-seeking that reestablishes the identity of missing persons; it has been in operation since 2001 and has run alongside the aforementioned criminal justice efforts. State sponsored truth-seeking mechanisms have also been implemented parallel to criminal justice efforts. The Srebrenica commission was in operation at the same time as the state court in BiH was conducting war crimes trials. Other truth-seeking mechanisms include the efforts of human rights NGOs in BiH, Croatia, Kosovo and Serbia to establish credible and comprehensive lists of killed and missing in the conflicts, and not least the RECOM initiative. All successor states to the former Yugoslavia have instituted mechanisms that seek to provide war compensation notwithstanding the general rule that benefits for former combatants are disproportionately more favorable than those received by civilian victims. Like other mechanisms of transitional justice applied in the Western Balkans, these mechanisms of compensation have run in parallel with trials and truth-seeking efforts. And, in BiH at least, there has been a process of vetting of the police force in order to remove known perpetrators from service, which again was implemented in parallel with other dealing with the past processes.
28. This very brief overview of transitional justice mechanisms is by no means an exhaustive list of measures that have been employed in the successor states to the former Yugoslavia, but it serves to illustrate that the implementation of transitional justice mechanisms need not be sequential, but concurrent, that is operating in parallel – at that same time.
29. It is therefore a false dilemma to suggest that you can have either truth-seeking, meaning here the location, recovery and identification of missing persons, or memorialization, but not both at the same time. In the Western Balkans, domestic rule of law institutions exist, which, with continued ICMP technical assistance means that the process of locating, recovering and identifying missing persons on the one hand can take place concurrently with the development of universal forms of memorialization on the other.
30. In Slavonski Brod, Ivan Pšenica of the Union of killed and missing Croatian defenders and civilians, said, "40,000 persons went missing and we are still searching for 14,000. It is indeed a large number and it needs to be resolved... I support ICMP taking an active role in the process of memorialization;

however, I believe that the focus should remain on resolving the remaining 14,000 cases of missing persons and bringing those responsible to justice. Only then can we think about creating a monument, somewhere in former Yugoslavia, to all victims... ICMP's priority should be 14,000 missing persons and work on the issue of memorials is but inhibiting efforts to find the remaining missing persons."

31. While this view holds some value, if one accepts the conclusion that the missing persons issue is to a fair degree marginalized by society in the countries of the Western Balkans, it might be argued that by developing a memorial to all missing persons through a process involving various segments of society, such as youth, artists, academics, the governmental and non-governmental sectors, and not least associations of families of missing persons, a significant increase in societal awareness of missing persons issue will result which in turn can only help accelerate the truth-seeking process of locating, recovering and identifying the remaining missing. In similar vein, while Ljiljana Alvir of the citizens association of mothers of Vukovar argues that "memorials will not resolve the missing persons issue [but] stop the process because the responsible would think that enough has been done to resolve the issue", it should be kept in mind that, if done right – that is if a memorial is developed with the full participation of key segments of society and adhering to the principles that were outlined at the conference on the Missing, Memory and Sites of Conscience – the memorial will have the potential to actually reinvigorate the missing persons process by asking questions, by starting conversations about the past, and those who perished. A memorial is not the end of the story, but a beginning.
32. Indeed, during the consultation process, a significant number of participants expressed support for a memorial as a means of acknowledgment, recognition, and conflict prevention.
33. Dragan Pjevač, of the Association of families of missing persons Suza, said, "I believe it is possible. The time has come for associations to ask for recognition of my victims and others' victims... We have come to the point when we speak together about memorials and the process of memorialization..." Marinko Đurić, of the Association of kidnapped and missing in Kosovo and Metohija, said, "In regard to goals and intentions of commemoration, I agree that they should inspire reflection... A memorial should be a warning – they should not be insulting; rather they should be a confirmation that something horrible happened. They should warn our younger generations that it should never happen again." In similar vein, Ervin Blažević, of the NGO "Optimisti" said, "This memorial should have a focus on the future and a message for future generations. It must educate future generations; it must teach them to recognize in good time when evil is being prepared." Mirjana Miodrag Božin, of the Association of missing, arrested and detained Serbs in Croatia, said: "Instead of waiting for the identification of all missing, it is better to develop a joint memorial now – to have a central memorial as a warning." Čedomir Marić, of the Association of families of missing persons – Suza, said "the process of memorialization is more than creating memorials. The process should convey a message about the conflict so that it does not ever happen again." His oblique warning was: "Let us do nothing if we are not to convey the message that the conflict should never happen again."

IV. A memorial to whom?

34. One of the foremost questions that must be answered when developing a memorial is: to what or whom is the memorial dedicated?
35. Louis Bickford suggests that in the classic memorialization paradigm the emphasis of the memorial tends to be exclusively the glory of the nation or the grieving for fallen heroes, often soldiers that gave their lives for the nation. He suggests also that there is a gender aspect to memory in the classic paradigm. It tends to focus on male heroes and male imagery often because men are involved directly in war. Bickford argues that a new paradigm emerges after the Second World War, which is linked to transitional justice; that is, confronting the past to build a better future. This new paradigm is very much linked to the term "never again." The new paradigm seeks to answer the question: How can we engage with traumatic memory in a way that leads to "never again"?

36. The new paradigm is inclusive. The focus shifts from the glory of the nation and of fallen heroes, towards a focus on the victims of conflict and the memorialization of their suffering. Likewise the gender focus shifts from a male oriented one to one that begins to capture the experience of women and their stories in times of massive violations of human rights. It is not about the male heroes. It is not necessarily about the dominant ethnic group in a particular society. It is about inclusion, conversation; it is about non-powerful groups articulating memory in a public space.
37. Working within the new memorialization paradigm, the ICMP-facilitated consultations have yielded three concrete proposals as to whom a memorial should be dedicated. One proposal is for a memorial to all victims, here the meaning of victim was understood to mean all killed and missing in the armed conflicts of the 1990s in the territory of the former Yugoslavia irrespective of status as either a combatant or non-combatant. Such a memorial would pay tribute in equal measure to both killed and missing soldiers and civilians alike. Another proposal was for a memorial to all civilian victims, that is to all civilians who were killed, disappeared, or were camp detainees or victims of torture. The key element is that combatants are not included in the dedication of the memorial. A third proposal was for a joint memorial to all missing persons irrespective of status as civilian or combatant, or religious, ethnic or national belonging.
38. This taxonomy of potential groups to whom a memorial might be dedicated may appear to be splitting hairs; however the consultation indicates that the distinction between combatant and civilian is a vital one.
39. In Belgrade, Čedomir Marić, said “The monument must be dedicated to the victims.” In Doboj, Veljko Lazić, of the Republican Organization of Killed and Detained Soldiers and Missing Persons of Republic Srpska, said: “I am for raising a joint memorial but with consideration for all victims...”
40. But whose victims? And should the term victim encompass killed and missing combatants in addition to civilian victims?
41. In Belgrade, Gordana Đikanović, of the Association of the Families of Kidnapped, Murdered and Missing Serbs in Kosovo, said, “Civilian victims are equal throughout the region. But the situation is different in terms of soldiers and there may problems if a joint memorial is dedicated to both civilians and soldiers.” In Mostar, Suzana Božić, from the NGO Catholic Relief Service, said, “There should be a joint memorial to the victims. But we should differentiate between combatants and civilians.”
42. The ICMP-facilitated consultation in Sarajevo brought into relief two opposing views about whether soldiers and civilians can or should be jointly memorialized. For many inhabitants of the Federation of BiH no comparison can be made or alluded to whatsoever. Simply put, soldiers and civilians cannot sit side by side on a memorial. However, for many other inhabitants of the Federation of BiH that realize rights to benefits under the Law on the Rights of Defenders and their Families, there is an ambiguity; many of the families who obtain benefits under this law perceive their missing relatives as innocent civilians yet they are recognized under the law as defenders.
43. Hasan Nuhanović, the strategic planning expert adviser at the Srebrenica Potočari Memorial, said “Any memorial must be dedicated exclusively to civilian victims... I believe that the name of a son who was innocently killed and someone who fought in the army and participated in the killing should not stand together.” Zijo Smajilović, of the Mothers of Srebrenica and Žepa Enclaves, said, “A soldier and a civilian cannot be treated the same.” Refika Ališković, of the NGO Bridges of Freedom, concurred “A memorial should be only for missing civilians.” Nura Begović expanded on this viewpoint, “We cannot build a memorial with the names of those who are innocently killed and those who participated in the battle. A memorial should be built exclusively for civilian victims of war.” Amela Međuseljac, of the Association Women Victims of War, simply said “Missing soldiers and civilians cannot be together.” Meliha Merdžić, also of the Association Women Victims of War, put it pithily “I would never allow

the name of my brother to be found next to the name of a soldier on the same memorial. Civilians are one thing soldiers are another.”

44. But then, other ICMP interlocutors took a very different position. Ema Čekić, of the Association of Missing Persons of the Vogošča, put forward the view that “If we start to separate missing persons on the basis of civilians and soldiers that will raise another issue because some [families] have a status [i.e. have rights to access benefits] due to the loss of our loved ones as soldiers. I now have a status and if my husband were put there [among civilians] I would have a conflict of interest. But we must all, all families, who have accessed benefits under the law (the BiH Federation Law on the Rights of Defenders and their Families) discuss this matter.
45. Munevera Avdić, of the Association of Killed, Captured and Missing Persons “Vrbanja” Kotor Varoš, supported this opinion: “If a person was a soldier, and if he disappeared, that person will be sought and will be registered as missing. I see no reason not to include him with civilian missing.
46. The ICMP-facilitated consultation also brought into sharp relief the view, especially among Croatian associations of families of missing persons, that the distinction between aggressor and defender should be clearly delineated in memorial practice. In Slavonski Brod, Juliana Rosandić, of the Association of Civilian Victims of the Homeland War, said, “Without a doubt we should honor the victims, but I also think we should be cautious. All sides feel that they were the greatest victim. I am afraid that it would take quite a while before we settle disputes about that.” Ivan Pšenica concurred: “There are attempts to relativize crimes in the region. It is not realistic to expect us in Croatia to accept the idea of a common memorial. According to Croatian laws we have 75 memorials of 143 mass graves, which are the result of Serb aggression. We have made efforts in Croatia to create a monument to all victims, but only of Greater Serbian aggression.” Similarly, Ljiljana Alvir said “When we talk of creating a joint memorial we talk about the equalization of aggressor and victim – we cannot let that happen...”
47. Other consultation participants, such as Goran Bubalo of the NGO Catholic Relief Service, took a broader view of the focus of a memorial. He said: “Monuments in Bosnia and Herzegovina divide people. You suffered truly, but other countries suffered as well and they built joint memorials focusing on their victims. I believe that we can build such a memorial in BiH. We all suffered as ethnic groups, but the most important point is that we as human beings suffered, and that has to be the message... We need a memorial to all victims of the wars in this region because victims are victims, and we all agree on that.”
48. During the consultation process, one ICMP interlocutor questioned the very concept of memorializing missing persons. Hasan Nuhanovic pointed out that “The term ‘missing’ is inappropriate for memorialization... I think that is the wrong approach to put the missing on a memorial. I am absolutely against a memorial that gathers combatants and innocent victims together under the label of missing persons.”
49. Others, however, pointed to the acute need for memorializing missing persons, especially in view of the particularity of the missing persons issue and the fact that it is unrealistic to presume that all missing persons will be recovered and identified. With no identified mortal remains and no graves, for the families of some missing persons a memorial may be all they have. As Edin Ramulić said “Some families have not received information yet about 10,000 people for whom they are still searching and we should have a place [a memorial] that will pay tribute to them.” Ervin Blažević noted “This [universal memorial] gives satisfaction to those who will never find their own [missing relatives]. We do not want to equalize crimes but we want to bring them [the victims] closer. A memorial should therefore be dedicated only to missing persons and not all victims... The point is that the memorial is not about all who perished, but all who are missing – to gather all (soldiers and civilians alike) together and say that they are missing.” Commenting on missing persons from the municipality of Vlasenica, Dževad Bektašević said, “We are still searching for more than 50% of the missing persons. The rationale for a memorial for us is the verdicts of the ICTY and judgments of national courts. For these persons a memorial would be the only evidence that these people ever existed.”

V. Location, location, location

50. Another key issue that must be addressed when developing a memorial is where to put it? In consultation with associations of families of missing persons the issue of location yielded a number of salutary observations and proposals.
51. In Doboij, Veljko Lazić, of the Republican Organization of Killed and Detained Soldiers and Missing Persons of Republic Srpska, said: “And where should a joint memorial be raised? There is no such city in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Something in us must change before it [a joint memorial] can be built.” In Mostar, Sarafina Kolovrat, said: “Memorials should start in smaller communities, local communities. To undertake such projects in the region will be very difficult.”
52. Some participants suggested that memorials should be located in neutral locations. In Mostar, Zlatko Prkić, of the Association of Prisoners, Vareš, said: “There should be a universal memorial, be it in Bosnia or in the wider region. That is something that should be discussed further. The memorial should be constructed at a neutral location, where conflict did not take place, but at the same time it should be visible to everyone since it should express condolence and respect for victims. It is important to find such a location, where mass murders did not take place.”
53. In contrast, others suggested that memorials, if they are to have meaning and effect change, should be located in the very places where crimes were committed. In Belgrade, Marinko Đurić, of the Association of kidnapped and missing in Kosovo and Metohija, said: “The most natural thing would be to create memorials in places where things have occurred and by doing so convey a message and influence reconciliation. I think a memorial should be created in a place where it was established that people were killed. When the facts are established and when the number of missing is established. It is more important to create memorials in Sarajevo and Pristina, because more people were killed there.”
54. A number of interlocutors asserted that priority should be given to national memorials in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Meliha Merdžić said ‘My opinion is that a memorial should be built in Bosnia and Herzegovina. I’m not for building one in other countries. Ervin Blažević stated “I would not build a memorial in the region, but in Bosnia and Herzegovina, which would send a strong message to the wider region.” Dževad Bektašević suggested that “If the outcome of the consultation process is to build only one memorial, then it should be in the center of the region. And the center of the region is Visoko-Sarajevo in Bosnia and Herzegovina.”
55. While some such as Munevera Avdić opined that “a universal approach for the entire region cannot be done”, others stressed the counterpoint. Gordana Đikanović said, "If memorials are to be created, they should be identical in all countries of the region and all areas affected by armed conflicts." Šefika Muratagić proposed “a universal monument to be dedicated to all missing persons or to all victims in the region” stressing the importance of “a regional approach because only then can we achieve universal remembrance. If we do this only in BiH we will certainly not find a solution. I propose a universal complex with the same appearance be built in Zagreb, Sarajevo and Belgrade.” Edin Ramulić chimed “The universal can be achieved by raising [memorials] in different places by making one identical monument, and this same symbolic memorial should be raised in Belgrade and then in other cities.”

VI. Naming names: Getting the numbers right

56. If it is critical that a memorial not exclude anyone, then any memorial that is inscribed with the names of the victims must include all names or none at all. But what’s in a name? In the former Yugoslavia, while a Croat, a Bosniak or a Serb might not be readily distinguishable by physical appearance; their names generally give a good indication. In the Western Balkans the numbers of losses from the Second World War are still contested as too are the losses during the wars of the 1990s in order to justify post-war gains or claims on the basis of being the biggest victim. By inscribing the names of all victims on a

joint memorial the results of the competition to demonstrate which community is the biggest victim would quite literally be set in stone – visible for all to see. For some the apparent fear is that, by laying bear the facts – that is by listing all victims by name on a memorial – established national narratives of one-sided suffering at the hands of an aggressor will be eroded. For others, the benefit of a memorial inscribed with the names of missing persons is testament to the suffering of that particular group.

57. It could be argued that such a joint memorial, bearing the names of all victims, would contribute to a more multi-perspectival understanding of the past, which could only be to the benefit of society in the Western Balkans.
58. Concerning Croatia, Ivan Pšenica, said “A register of civilian victims of war has not been made yet. No institution has launched an initiative to make such a list. There are various reasons; it could be that someone does not want to include certain names in the list...” Ljiljana Alvir added “We have accepted the idea that commissions for missing persons have a role to play with regard to the number of missing persons. But there are many centers and organizations present different information and these numbers are exaggerated.”
59. Edin Ramulić asserted that “In addition to honoring and recognizing victims the function of a memorial is truth-telling... While facts are determined by courts, or through the CEN (Central Register of Missing Persons), a memorial should be telling the truth about the number of missing in a specific area: the main function of a memorial is to tell the truth.”
60. Ema Čekić pointed out that “Names would be a warning to all, and those names can be viewed as facts.” In this way names are markers of victimhood and might be perceived as credits upon which post-war claims rest.
61. Sead Golić, of the Associations of families of missing persons, forcibly taken away and killed Bosniaks from Brčko District, noted: “[In Brčko District] the High Representative, Gregorian, came up with the idea of only one memorial for civilian war victims which would include the names of the victims. ... The Serbs did not agree because the memorial is for civilian war victims and they only have fallen fighters. But the Croats and we Bosniaks agreed that it should include the names of the victims. We made a list of civilian war victims to be inscribed on the memorial. When the Serbs complained the High Representative issued a decision that the memorial should have no names inscribed on it. We do not agree with that. Let it show all the names. We are not interested in a memorial without names....”
62. Associations of families of missing persons discussed at length the question of whether memorials should bear the names of the victims or not during the consultation process. Arguments were presented both for and against memorials being inscribed with the names of victims.
63. Čedomir Marić said: “If we want to create something central, it should differ from other memorials. It should be a simple memorial with an unambiguous message: in memory of all victims killed in the period 1991 – 1995... There is a genuine fear about putting names on a memorial, because a name might be forgotten and then the feelings of that family would be hurt. In that sense it might be the best course of action not to inscribe the names of the victims on a memorial – so that no one is excluded.”
64. In contrast, Marinko Đurić, of the Association of kidnapped and missing in Kosovo and Metohija, said, “I believe that the names should be written as a warning to all. It’s not okay that a memorial is left blank. We are not dealing with criminals; we are dealing with innocent victims and we should not be ashamed because someone was killed.” “Should memorials include the names of all missing persons? I think a memorial has a purpose and a message and it must include the names because the missing were human beings, individuals, who had names”, said Dževad Bektašević.
65. Consultation participants discussed the need for rigorous methodologies for establishing lists of victims, which was felt by many to be a pre-requisite of raising any memorial.

66. Ljiljana Alvir said “Before anything else, we need to determine the number of missing.”
67. In Mostar, Anđelko Kvesić, said, “We need the facts. Without the facts there can be no reconciliation and no memorials. Memorials should [...] indicate from where victims come. It would be good to have a unique criterion that would refer to all victims.”
68. Veljko Lazić said “Before we can have a joint memorial center we need to know the numbers of those killed and missing... The exact number of killed and missing must be known, and only then can we make a joint memorial for the victims.”
69. Gordana Đikanović said, “In my opinion we should start thinking about an independent institution, an institute, which would bring together and list everything, make checks and create a joint list. Creating memorials will not be possible without a unified list.”
70. Olgica Božanić, of the Association of Family Members of Missing and Kidnapped Individuals, said “In Washington DC we visited the Holocaust Memorial Museum. There we saw a database containing the names and details of Jews who were killed in Kosovo during the Second World War. Experts should be working on [something like] this to create a memorial center with an archive and a database of missing persons. We should also get young people to work on this database, if the time to erect memorials in the region comes.”
71. In Mostar, Vera Jovanović, of the Helsinki Committee for Human Rights, said: “In my opinion it is important to establish the facts about victims and through that we can “unwrap” our past. That would be possible through the establishment of a memorial center dedicated to the victims. Victims can contribute a great deal to developing a memorial center. The establishment of such a center will “unwrap” the past and provide information about both victims and perpetrators.”
72. Sead Golić suggested “All the names of missing persons could be entered into a database that might be accessed in a memorial room or memorial rooms across the region.”
73. James May, of the Biljana Kovačević Vučo Foundation, suggested that the process of developing the memorial might involve families of missing persons from across the region working collaboratively with other relevant actors such as commissions on missing persons, and NGOs such as the HLC in Serbia and Kosovo, and Documenta in Croatia, gathering personal details on all missing persons, verifying that data, and compiling a comprehensive and credible list of missing persons. Such a process would be the precursor of establishing a monumental memorial – showing all data of all missing persons – and by virtue of its size it would have a thought-provoking presence.”

VII. Who should have a say in the development of a memorial?

74. Throughout the consultation process, associations of families of missing persons and other civil society organizations demonstrated a consensus of opinion regarding who should be consulted about the development of a joint memorial to missing persons. There was a strong opinion that first and foremost the associations of families of missing persons from across the region should be regularly consulted about the development, form and substance of any memorial. There was a consensus that the authorities should be strongly involved in the process. It was felt that the media, civil society and the academic community, particularly historians, should have a role in the process too. Youth was also prioritized as a key segment of society that should be involved in the process of developing a memorial, for – as was first said at the *Promoting a Holistic Approach to Memorials and Remembrance* conference in December 2010 – a memorial is not to help the families of the missing to remember a loved one, but for the next generation, for youth, to remember and pay tribute to the victims, and learn from the past. Needless to say, there was a consensus that artists and architects should have a prominent role in interpreting the brief defined by the associations of families of missing persons and

other stakeholders involved in conceptualizing the memorial and propose appropriate forms for its physical realization. It was also suggested that an opinion poll be conducted to see what people think about a joint a memorial.

75. Sarafina Kolovrat asserted that “In the first place the victims, or survivors, should be included in the process; they have to be the key driving force of the process. They should be asked for consent or approval for any memorial to be established.” Vera Jovanović, said “Youth should be included in the process and they should be given an opportunity to learn about the past and to build a better future.” It is important to include youth in the process of developing any future memorial so that its message and form resonates towards them for as Ratko Maunaga, of the Association of Families of Missing, Killed and Captured of Republika Srpska, Višegrad, said in Doboj, “The aim of a memorial is to be a place of coming closer. A memorial is not a place that divides but one that unites, especially youth.” Olgica Božanić said, “Media should be involved in this process to ensure that it has visibility and mobilizes society.” In Belgrade, Čedomir Marić suggested, “We need to include historic institutes. Without these institutions, we cannot move forward because we have a twisted picture about things which happened and everyone writes whatever suits their version of past events.”
76. Alongside these groups, ICMP’s interlocutors stressed the importance, and also difficulties, of including the authorities in discussions about memorializing missing persons. Suzana Božić, noted “We cannot start this process without the authorities and politicians.” Semina Alekić concurred “We need to involve the local authorities, representatives of government, in this dialogue.” But Meliha Merdžić pointed out that “We do not have the support of local communities nor the state.” Ema Čekić suggested “We need to include the state. We need to introduce this issue to the broader local community, and then we can make recommendations for a memorial for all to a higher level. We need to talk to and involve the state institutions. We speak with one another, but they – the state institutions – do not hear us.” Salih Rasavac concurred: “These discussions, which we have with each other, we need to have with local communities, with the local population so that people try to accept the truth and facts that relate to the monument with respect, and that is recognizing the victims.”

VIII. How might a memorial development process look?

77. In addition to discussing who should be involved in the process of developing a memorial as detailed above, ICMP’s interlocutors made a small number of proposals about how a memorial development process might look.
78. Šefika Muratagić suggested “a mixed regional working group should be established to guide the process of building a memorial; it should include: the governmental and NGO sector, spatial planning experts, artists, victim associations, experts in the field of planning. The memorial selection committee should be representatives of the same group. The process should be long.”
79. Milada Hodžić proposed that “In future, consultations on memorials should be organized in local communities, in Prijedor, Brčko, Vlasenica, wherever other associations of families can attend. It is important that local authorities participate as well as other community leaders.”
80. The process of how a memorial development process might look will be elaborated further in future, consultations facilitated by ICMP on the development of a universal memorial to all missing persons irrespective of national, ethnic or religious origin. The process, may, for example, comprise some or all of the following elements:
 - a) a consultation process with associations of families of missing persons and other key stakeholders, such as the authorities, youth, the NGO community, historians, to determine what the role and function of the memorial should be in broad terms, to determine the message it should convey and to outline its key attributes;

- b) the implementation of a public call for proposals for memorial designs that would address the basic elements of the memorial as defined through the consultation process. A part of the selection process might involve the establishment of focus groups of key stakeholders, associations of families of missing persons, the authorities, youth, etc. to assess the extent to which the proposed designs have resonance, that is the extent to which they are felt to fulfill the conceptual elements of the memorial as defined in the consultation process;
 - c) the establishment of a memorial design selection committee that would be tasked with shortlisting and selecting the final memorial design. Consideration should be given to the composition of the memorial design selection committee so as to ensure that no key stakeholders are excluded;
 - d) the physical realization of the memorial design, that is the creation of the memorial itself. Consideration should be given to issues such as how the memorial will be funded and all necessary fundraising arrangements should be completed in a timely way.
 - e) opening the memorial: starting the dialogue about the past. Appropriate arrangements should be made for an appropriate inaugural ceremony for the memorial. Special consideration should be given to who the guest speakers should be and the speeches that are made. Strong media coverage would be beneficial.
 - f) follow up activities should be coordinated, which might comprise site visits, and talks and lectures at the memorial, etc.
81. The aforementioned elements are not prescriptive, but are intended to illustrate how a memorial development process might look. A comprehensive process for the development of a memorial should be defined in future consultations with associations of families of missing persons and other key stakeholders.

IX. Who should pay for a memorial?

82. The authorities? The international community? Victims groups? This question goes to the heart of the issue of acknowledgement and responsibility. Memorial practice from around the world shows that in a large number of instances memorials and monuments are raised, sometimes almost spontaneously, by victims groups or by the close family of the victims. They reflect the fact that the families of the victims simply wish to pay tribute to their killed or missing loved ones. Often modest in design and scale, these simple memorials are paid for by the families themselves.
83. But if memorialization is primarily concerned with acknowledgement of the victims and their surviving families, the question emerges: who should be doing the acknowledging? Which might also translate as who is responsible for raising, including paying for, a memorial. It is a question of responsibility.
84. If the victims, here meaning also the families of the victims, have a right to reparation including acknowledgement, then there is an affirmative obligation upon states, whose predecessor governments ordered and had massive and systematic violations of human rights carried out in the first place, to acknowledge the victims. This might be achieved through a variety of means, including the development and raising of appropriate memorials. Of course, if there is no serious effort to establish the truth about past violations and bring perpetrators to justice, then the establishment of a memorial might be seen only as a callous gesture of false contrition. But, if a memorial is established as part of a holistic approach to dealing with a legacy of past crimes including truth-seeking and criminal prosecutions, then they have the potential to be an effective means of acknowledging the victims and the suffering of the surviving families.
85. At the low-key consultation in Belgrade, one interlocutor suggested that the international community should fund any memorial to the victims. This may be justifiable from a socio-economic perspective: the states of the Western Balkans are after all by no means especially affluent countries. But if a memorial is about the state acknowledging the victims and the suffering that its agents caused in the past, to demand that the international community pay for a memorial is to miss the point. Rather, there

is a strong moral imperative for states that caused harm to the victims and their families in the past to at the very least acknowledge the victims, and the harm done to them and their families. By supporting the raising of appropriate memorials, as part of a comprehensive approach to dealing with past abuse, states acknowledge the victims, and send a strong message to future generations that the crimes that occurred in the past should never be repeated. In the Western Balkans, where victims and their families crave acknowledgement, and the need for measures to support a sustainable peace and the notion of “never again” is acute, the establishment of a universal memorial to all missing persons irrespective of national, ethnic or religious origin acquires crucial significance.

X. Conclusions

86. Overall, the consultations on memorialization have been productive and fruitful. Engagement with the thematic issues of the international conference on ‘*Promoting a Holistic Approach to Memorials and Remembrance*’ was extremely positive. Participants demonstrated a genuine interest in the process of memorialization and remembrance and were receptive to future dialogue and initiatives. Furthermore, in establishing a set of principles that should guide a process of memorialization, working groups at the conference on ‘*the Missing, Memory and Sites of Conscience*’ were able to forge a general consensus regarding the aims and objectives of post-conflict memorialization in the region.
87. The mono-ethnic low-key consultations which ICMP facilitated with associations of families of missing persons and representatives of civil society organizations highlighted many of the challenges and obstacles which exist in seeking to create a universal memorial in a post-conflict setting. Families stressed that the search for missing relatives was of paramount importance and expressed reservations that memorialization might adversely affect or marginalize this process. Although there was a perception that memorialization and truth-seeking measures were mutually exclusive, there was also recognition on the part of some that these mechanisms could operate in tandem and in many respects strengthen the missing persons process as a result.
88. A range of opinions currently exists about both the form and subject matter of any proposed memorial. While most would agree that the victims of the conflict and the memorialization of their suffering should be the predominant focus, the term ‘victim’ has proven itself to be a highly malleable concept. Divergent narratives emerge as to whether the term should include killed and missing combatants in addition to civilian victims and opposition to jointly memorializing the two is evident in some quarters. It is a multifaceted issue, complicated further in Bosnia and Herzegovina by the fact that some families have obtained benefits because of missing relatives which are categorized under the Law on the Rights of Defenders.
89. The consultation process has brought into sharp relief the fact that a memorial to missing persons is imperative for at least two reasons. First, it is unrealistic to expect that all missing persons will be recovered and identified. Therefore, for the families who do not receive information about their missing relatives and who will not be able to recover the mortal remains it is critical that they have a place or a memorial that pays tribute to missing persons collectively. Such a memorial will give satisfaction to those who will never find their own missing relatives. Second, a universal memorial to missing persons will significantly contribute to reconciliation efforts by sending the message that what crimes occurred in the past should never again be repeated.
90. The consultation process yielded constructive insights and opinions regarding the location of any proposed memorial. Suggestions ranged from having memorials in local communities or in neutral locations unaffected by the conflict to those which advocated that memorialization should take place in the very place where crimes were committed in order to promote reflection and reconciliation. The possibility of a universal approach to memorialization for the entire region was also discussed and a number of practical proposals were mentioned such as having a central memorial in the region or replicating one identical monument throughout a number of cities.

91. Difficulty also surrounds the question of inscribing names on a memorial. For some participants, the rationale and motivation underpinning their desire to have the names of all victims included on a memorial appears at odds with the reconciliatory objectives of memorialization. For some, inscribing names is an exercise in 'victimhood' and ascertaining who suffered the most while others feel it will challenge inaccurate national narratives and establish the truth. It is worth noting that despite arguments for and against memorials being inscribed; a number of issues relating to the ability to accurately establish numbers and the possibility that a name might be forgotten were raised, further complicating the matter.

XI. Recommendations

92. In order to expand and build upon the substantial interest in developing a universal memorial that exists in the region, further dialogue is required on a range of issues. Facilitating additional local and regional consultation meetings with key stakeholders would be a tangible point of departure. Such meetings could be used to promote a greater understanding of the pivotal role which memorialization can play in the process of reconciliation and not least in expediting the process of locating, recovering and identifying missing persons. It would also allow for discussion, debate and possible compromise on the more complex and tenuous questions of who should be memorialized and whether names should be inscribed.
93. A comprehensive process for the development of a memorial should be defined in future consultations with associations of families of missing persons and other key stakeholders. The Regional Coordination of associations of families of Missing Persons from the former Yugoslavia has the potential to form the kernel of a mixed regional working group that might guide the process of developing a memorial.
94. There is a concern amongst associations of families of missing persons that the process of memorialization might detract from the search for missing persons and consign it to the peripheries, when in fact the opposite is actually true; a societal dialogue on how we memorialize missing persons can only bring the issue of locating, recovering and identifying missing persons more into the public eye. In order to address and alleviate these concerns it is essential that the associations of families comprehend the positive and beneficial impact that memorialization can have in the quest for answers and recovery and identification of remains. A comprehensive series of workshops should be held for the associations of families of missing persons to explain and illustrate the benefits of memorialization and how it can bolster and augment the search for missing persons. These workshops will illustrate how the process of developing a universal memorial can shed much needed attention on the issue of missing persons in a multitude of ways. By analyzing the objectives of memorialization and examining other post-conflict societies, associations of families will learn how memorialization can foster an atmosphere of reconciliation, open up dialogue about the past, encourage the exchange of critical information pertaining to relatives and ultimately generate much needed media and political attention around the issue of missing persons.
95. Provision should also be made for youth involvement in the memorialization process. It was widely acknowledged during the initial phase that youth participation in the creation of a memorial is important in order for the next generation to learn from the past. To that end, a multi-ethnic consultation involving youth organizations from all sectors of society should be arranged to establish their ideas and input.
96. Discussions involving local authorities should be organized as a means of canvassing opinion, highlighting the extent of civil society interest in memorialization and underscoring the need for and benefits of constructive political involvement. The engagement and support of local authorities with the memorialization process will hopefully act as a catalyst for state level backing and involvement.
97. Considering the fact that the idea of universal memorialization has purchase within many sectors of society, it is important that the project continue to move forward and gather momentum. Inviting artists

and planning experts to give their thoughts on a possible memorial design in addition to arranging study trips for key stakeholders to envisage what form a memorial might take will also be beneficial.

98. Consideration should be given to the development of a regional database of missing persons as a virtual memorial to missing persons from the Western Balkans. It would exist nowhere, and yet would be accessible everywhere thus resolving the issue of location. As a regional memorial containing the names of all missing persons, gathered through a comprehensive process of compiling lists of missing persons held by state institutions, such as commissions on missing persons, and by non-governmental organizations, such as associations of families of missing persons, it would have the potential to encourage a multidimensional understanding of the recent past and break down tendentious national narratives.

Annex I: Participants from the low-key consultations

Mostar

Amela Suljić, ICMP

Andelko Kvesić, Croatian Association of Ex Camp Inmates of Homeland War in BiH, Busovača

Ivanka Ljubić, Community of Cantonal Associations of the Killed and Missing Homeland Defenders, Posušje

Josip Drežnjak, Association of Croat Victims "Grabovica '93" Mostar

Lejla Bradić, Helsinki Committee for Human Rights BiH

Marijana Beslić, Family Association of Killed and Missing Croatian Defenders, Posušje

Matthew Holiday, ICMP

Nevenka Tabaković, Family Association of Killed and Missing Persons Bugojno

Sarafina Kolovrat, Family Association of Killed and Missing Defenders of Homeland War, Bugojno

Suzana Božić, Carritas

Vera Jovanović, Helsinki Committee for Human Rights BiH

Zdenka Polić, Family Association of Killed and Missing Croatian Defenders Posušje

Zlatko Prkić, Croatian Association of Ex Camp Inmates of Homeland War in BiH, Vareš

Zvonimir Kubinek, Association of Families of Croatian Defenders Fallen and Missing from Homeland War "Soli" – Tuzla and member of Advisory Board to BH Missing Persons Institute

Doboj

Boro Peulić, Republican Organization of Killed and Detained Soldiers and Missing Persons of Republic Srpska, Republican Board of Families of Missing Prnjavor

Dobrinka Trifković, Association of Families of Captured and Fallen Soldiers and Civilians RS – Municipal organization Bijeljina

Dragiša Andrić, Regional Association of Detained Višegrad

Dušan Malić, Municipal Organization of Families of Killed Soldiers and Missing Civilians Derventa

Goran Bubalo, Catholic Relief Service

Jela Todorović – Mandić, Association of Families of Missing Civilians and Soldiers of Upper-Drina Region

Milan Mandić, Association of Families of Missing Persons of Sarajevo-Romanija region

Milka Kovačić, Association of Missing Persons Bratunac - Srebrenica

Miodrag Zimonjić, Association of Killed and Missing Soldiers and Civilian of war Serbs of Brčko Municipality

Mladen Grujičić, Municipal Organization of Families of Captured Soldiers and Missing Civilians Srebrenica

Nikola Todorović, Republican Organization of Killed and Detained Soldiers and Missing Persons of Republic Srpska, Republican Board of Families of Missing Banja Luka

Radomirka Duvnjak, Municipal Board of Families of Missing Persons Vlasenica

Ratomir Maunaga, Association of Missing, Killed and Captured Families of Republic Srpska, Višegrad

Smilja Mitrović, Association of Families of Missing Soldiers and Civilians of Semberija and Majeвица

Staka Petrović, Municipal Organization of Families of Captured and Killed Soldiers and Missing Civilians

Zvornik

Veljko Lazović, Republican Organization of Killed and Detained Soldiers and Missing Persons of Republic Srpska

Slavonski Brod

Anica Jakopiček, Family Association of Captures and Missing "Croatia's Mother", Vinkovci

Barica Turuk, Union of the Associations of Croatian Civilian Victims of Homeland War of Croatia, Pakrac

Dinko Miovec, Union of Associations of Families of Captured and Missing Croatian Defenders, Lipik

Dragica Marinković, Union of Civilian Victims of Homeland War, Vinkovci

Drago Klaić, Union of Associations of Families of Captured and Missing Croatian Defenders, Pakrac

Iva Adžijević, Union of Associations of Families of Captured and Missing Croatian Defenders, Pakrac

Ivan Pšenica, Union of Associations of Families of Captured and Missing Croatian Defenders, Zagreb
Ivka Trajković, Union of Civilian Victims of Homeland War, Tenja
Jasna Jug, Association of Families of Captured and Missing “Croatian Phoenix”, Zagreb
Josip Muzić, Association of Families of Captured and Missing “Croatian Phoenix”, Zagreb
Josip Salaj, Union of Civilian Victims of Homeland War, Tenja
Julijana Rosandić, Union of the Associations of Croatian Civilian Victims of Homeland War of Croatia, Slavonski Brod
Ljiljana Alvir, Union of Associations of Families of Captured and Missing Croatian Defenders, Vukovar
Manda Patko, Association of Captured and Missing Croatian Defenders “Vukovar’s Mothers”, Vukovar
Marica Salaj, Union of Civilian Victims of Homeland War, Tenja
Marija Vražić, Union of Associations of Families of Captured and Missing Croatian Defenders, Zagreb
Marijana Tonković, Association of Families of Captured and Missing “Croatian Phoenix”, Zagreb
Siniša Mikolaš, Union of Civilian Victims of Homeland War, Tenja
Slavica Marinović, Union of the Associations of Croatian Civilian Victims of Homeland War of Croatia Zagreb
Spomenka Kusić, Family Association of Captures and Missing “Croatia’s Mother”, Vinkovci
Tamara Banjeglav, Documenta NGO

Belgrade

Brankica Antić, Association of Families of Kidnapped and Missing Persons from Kosovo and Metohija
Čedomir Marić, Association of Families of Missing Persons Suza
Cica Janković, Association of Families of Kidnapped and Missing Persons from Kosovo and Metohija, Belgrade
Cveta Nedeljković, Association of Families of Kidnapped and Killed in Kosovo and Metohija
Dragan Pjevač, Association of Families of Missing Persons Suza
Dragica Majstorović, Association of Families of Kidnapped and Missing Persons from Kosovo and Metohija, Belgrade
Dušanka Kojić, Association of Families of Missing Persons Suza
Gordana Bjelobrk, Association of Families of Missing Persons Suza
Gordana Đikanović, Association of Families of Kidnapped and Killed in Kosovo and Metohija
Gordana Ristić, Association of Families of Kidnapped and Missing Persons from Kosovo and Metohija, Belgrade
James May, Biljana Kovačević Vučo Foundation
Mara Bader, Association of Families of Missing Persons Suza
Marinko Đurić, Association of Families of Kidnapped and Killed in Kosovo and Metohija
Dragan Medić, Association of Parents and Families of Imprisoned, Captured and Missing Persons of Serbia and Montenegro
Mirjana Miodrag Božin, Association of Parents and Families of Imprisoned, Captured and Missing Persons of Serbia and Montenegro
Nataša Šćepanović, Association of Families of Kidnapped and Killed in Kosovo and Metohija
Olgica Božanić, Association of Families of Kidnapped and Missing Persons from Kosovo and Metohija, Belgrade
Snežana Zdravković, Association of Families of Kidnapped and Killed in Kosovo and Metohija
Vlado Šašo, Association of Families of Missing Persons Suza

Sarajevo

Aleksandra Nedzi, Track Impunity Always (TRIAL)
Amela Medjuseljac, Association Women Victims of War
Dževad Bektačević, Family Association of War Victims Vlasenica 1992-95
Edin Ramulić, Association of Women from Prijedor “Izvor”
Ema Čekić, Association of Families of Missing Persons of Municipality Vogošća

Emir Redžović, Association of Family Members of Missing Persons from the Area of Municipality of Kalinovik "Truth - Kalinovik '92"

Ervin Blažević, Association "Optimist" Kozarac

Hasan Nuhanović, Memorial Center Potočari

Kemal Pervan, Association of Family Members of Missing Persons from the Area of Municipality of Kalinovik "Truth - Kalinovik '92"

Mehmed Musić, Association for Tracing Captured and Missing from Hadžići

Melika Merdžić, Association Women Victims of War

Milada Hodžić, Association of Women from Prijedor "Izvor"

Mirsada Spahić, Association of Families of Missing Persons of Municipality Ilijaš

Munevera Avdić, Organization of Families of Killed, Captured and Missing Persons "Vrbanja" Kotor Varoš

Munira Subašić, Association of citizens "Mothers of Srebrenica and Žepa Enclaves"

Muradif Bureković, Association of Families of Captured and Missing Persons Kalesija '92

Nura Begović, Association of Citizens "Women of Srebrenica"

Refika Ališković, Association Bridges of Friendship, Prijedor

Safija Hrinjić, Association Families of Captured and Missing Persons Bosniaks "Prozor '92 - '95"

Salih Rasavac, Association Corridor

Sead Golić, Association for Tracing Missing and Killed Bosniaks of District Brčko, BiH

Šefika Maratagić, Citizens Association Key of Future

Semina Alekić, Organization of Families of Killed, Captured and Missing Persons "Vrbanja" Kotor Varoš

Zijad Smajilović, Association of citizens "Mothers of Srebrenica and Žepa Enclaves"