

The report was prepared by

Miloš Urošević with solidary support from Janja Beč

THE SOPHIE SCHOLL SCHOOL - WE WILL NOT BE SILENT

War crimes, genocide and memories. The roots of evil. I want to understand.

Women in black, Belgrade , 2012.

Report

The seminar was held on the 21st and 22nd of July 2012, in the offices of the Women in black in Belgrade . 18 activists from Belgrade , Novi Sad , Leskovac, Vlasotince, Kraljevo, Kotor and Sarajevo attended the seminar.

The seminar represents a first step toward the realization of our idea about starting the school 'Sophie Scholl - We will not be silent'.

The creator of the school and lecturer was prof. dr Janja Beč - Neumann, the coordinator of the cinematic program was Nataša Govedarica, and the school coordinator was Miloš Urošević.

On the first day of the conference, in the first part, the basic concepts (genocide, The Genocide Convention, the genocidal process, Raphael Lemkin, victims, perpetrators, bystanders, saviors and fighters in the resistance) were studied.

The genocide in Cambodia case study was done in the second part. Before the lecture about Cambodia we had a viewing of the documentary 'S 21 The Khmer Rouge Death Machine' by the Cambodian director Rithy Panna. The first day of the seminar was concluded with a walk and discussion along the Danube in Zemun.

On the second day of the conference the concepts of genocide denial, phases of the genocidal process, international criminal justice, the behavior of bystanders in the Holocaust and Srebrenica were analyzed. The documentary 'Living monument/Živi spomenik' by the director from Bosnia and Herzegovina Ines Tanovic was viewed in the second part of the second day.

In the end all participants had their own presentations based on the assigned texts from the reader. The seminar was concluded with a verbal public and numerical secret evaluation. The course was numerically marked with a 1,33% score. The best mark was 1.

A crime without a name - genocide - Rafael Lemkin

*What is genocide? Genocide - a word devised by Rafael Lemkin from the Greek word *genos*, meaning *tribe* and the Latin word *cedere* meaning *to kill*, thus: *to kill a tribe*.*

When news started to spread about the eradication of Jews in the Nazi Germany occupied territories in August of 1941, Churchill stated for the BBC: 'We are in the presence of a crime without a name'. Raphael Lemkin, a lawyer and a Polish Jew, said: 'Only human beings have laws...we must create a law (for this crime without a name)'. He was the creator of the so-called Lemkin's law, or rather the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, adopted unanimously on December 9th 1948 in Paris by the UN General Assembly.

For the first time people gave a name to that kind of murder - a crime without a name. The first version of The Convention included a fifth group - a political one, along with the other four that remained in The Convention: racial, religious, national and ethnic. But the political dimension was rejected at the insistence of the Soviet Minister for Foreign Affairs, Vyshinsky.

During the rule of the military junta in Argentina (1976-1983) around 60.000 people went missing according to the estimates of The Mothers of the Plaza de Mayo/Madres de Plaza de Mayo, while 10.000 are missing according to the report of 'Never Again/Nunca Mas', the commission of the President of Argentina Raul Alfonsino, and 500 according to the estimates of the Argentine police.

Those were all political murders. Today, the majority of researchers of genocide consider those missing in Argentina as genocide, even though they are a political group. This Convention is a basis for processing cases of genocide in international courts for Rwanda/ICTR, Yugoslavia/ICTY and the International criminal court/ICC as well as courts in Cambodia , Sierra Leone and East Timor .

Barbarism and vandalism

What is the Holocaust? Holocaust means burned alive in Greek. Shoa in Hebrew means great terrible wind. The word genocide was published for the first time in 1944 in the book 'Axis Rule in Occupied Europe' by Raphael Lemkin. He was already using the word at the time and explaining that the word destruction in The Convention doesn't have to mean only physical eradication of members of a group, but that it can also refer to the destruction of conditions that enable the group's survival. Genocide never happens by accident, there is always a plan. The plan is coordinated with the goal of destroying the fundamental conditions for human existence. It isn't just about the number of people killed, but the destruction of living conditions, issues like hunger and systematic bombing. More bombs were dropped on Cambodia in three years (1970-1973) than on Japan during the entire WWII. All that was done by the American aviation. Living conditions were being destroyed that way: rain forests, rice fields. 13.000 villages were destroyed and 700.000 people were killed.

The destruction of political, social, cultural institutions, language, nationality, religion, the economic existence of a group, health, human dignity and even life itself, all of this is considered as genocide if it has the intent to destroy a group. The destruction of cultural and political institutions that are vital for the survival of an endangered group can also be considered genocide. Courts for Cambodia , Argentina , Guatemala didn't exist during the cold war. The International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia/ICTY is the first

international criminal court that's not a military court. It was established after the end of the Cold War in Europe . After that the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda/ICTR was established, followed by special courts for Cambodia , Sierra Leone , East Timor and The International Criminal Court/ICC.

During the 1933 conference of European lawyers in Madrid , Lemkin wrote and proposed to the Conference a draft of an international law that would bind countries and their governments to 'prevent the intentional destruction of ethnic, national and religious groups.' Lemkin felt that it is important to protect both the physical and the cultural survival of targeted groups. The draft of this law that he had written and proposed to the Conference envisions a 'ban on barbarism and vandalism'. It determines barbarism as 'the destruction of national, religious, racial and social communities', and vandalism as 'the destruction of cultural and artistic treasure that is the expression of the being of those groups'. When Lemkin presented his proposal at the Conference, the president of the Supreme Court of Germany and the president of the Berlin University left the Conference.

The bill that Raphael Lemkin proposed wasn't adopted. The Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide was created after the end of WWII and the Holocaust in which 6 million Jews were killed and 5 million Russians, Poles, Roma, communists and other 'undesirables'. To this day 142 countries have signed The Convention. It doesn't serve only for punishment, but for prevention as well. In the ruling of The International Court of Justice in the case of Bosnia and Herzegovina vs Serbia from February 2007 it says that Serbia is to blame for not preventing the genocide in Srebrenica. Only in Serbia was that accepted as a victory.

To destroy a group and intention

In *article 2* of The Convention it says *the intention to completely or partially destroy a group*. The intention is the most difficult to prove. In discussions about The Convention, after it had been adopted, Lemkin said that the number of people killed was important, that the number was not insignificant. The International Criminal Courts until now never had, and still don't have, the capacity to try all the cases, that isn't possible, but there are determined criteria based on which the cases are regarded during trials.

What does it mean to destroy a group? ICTR, the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda , case Jean-Paul Akayesu, 1998, prosecutor Pierre Prosper, conducted the first indictment for genocide in international criminal law. His conception of the indictment was brilliant, and he managed to prove his case, with the court ruling that rape in war is genocide. He based the indictment on 'giving meaning to the word destroy', stating that 'If I could succeed in giving meaning to the word, I knew that I would breathe life into the Convention'. The complete or partial destruction of a group does not need to happen. He claimed that killing people is destruction, but so is destroying the intellectual class as well as the systematic rape of women. Prosper held that a group can physically survive and evade being killed, but that it remains in such a marginalized existence and becomes so irrelevant to the society that it is in fact (ruined.) destroyed. On September 22, 1998 the UN Tribunal for Rwanda/ICTR accepted the indictment and found 'The defendant, Jean-Paul Akayesu guilty of genocide'.

Students often ask if it's considered genocide when only a single member of a nation or another group is killed, and if that is genocide under international law. The answer is yes, that is theoretically possible, but has never happened and it's not very likely to happen in the future. Another question that students often pose concerns child soldiers. Under the articles 2-e of the Convention, '*the forced movement of children from one group to another*', and 2-d '*the introduction of measures with the intention of disabling the birth of children in a group*', as well as all other parts of article 2, a- *killing*, b- *causing serious physical and mental damage to group members*, c- *the intentional creation of living conditions that will bring about the complete or partial destruction of a group*, can all refer to children. For the first time in criminal law the International Criminal Court/ICC tried Tomas Lubanga from Congo **for recruiting children into military formations**. He was found guilty and sentenced to 14 years in prison.

In the Armenian genocide children were taken from Armenians and given to Kurdish families to be servants and slaves. In Argentina newborns were taken from women prisoners, the mothers were murdered, and the children adopted mostly by families of the Argentinian police, army and civil servants. Mothers of the Plaza de Mayo organized then to search for their missing children. Now they are searching for their missing grandchildren. Destruction can come in various forms. For instance, the program of euthanasia in Nazi Germany before WWII, when 60.000 people were killed because they 'weren't worthy of life because they were sick...and a burden for society'. Living conditions in Cambodia were destroyed by bombing rice fields and rain forests with agent orange.

The Hague Tribunal for former Yugoslavia wasn't created because of Srebrenica, but the municipalities in Bosanska Krajina. Today in ICTY we have that the court rejected the prosecutor's suggestion in the process against Radovan Karadzic that genocide was committed in the following municipalities: Bratunac, Foca, Kljuc, Prijedor, Sanski Most, Zvornik and Vlasenica. Genocide is limited to only one place - Srebrenica. Genocide is a process, not an occurrence in one place. In Serbia genocide began at Gazimestan, when a million people supported the war with ovations in 1989.

Some important authors in genocide studies

Helen Fein (sociologist) says that genocide is a *crime of the state*. *State structures work with coordination, intent and systemically*.

Israel Charny (psychologist) the founder of Holocaust and genocide studies claims that *genocides can (cannot) be compared*. *The victim must be helpless and unable to defend themselves*. Genocide happens when there is a *basic helplessness of the victim and a basic inability of the victim to defend themselves*.

Horowitz speaks of a structural and systemic destruction of innocent people through the bureaucratic apparatus of the state, meaning army, police, paramilitaries, post, railway, education.

Leo Kuper fought to have political groups be included in the Convention, but the balance of power in the Security Council was such that it was refused at the request of the Soviet Union .

Alvarez claims that different goals of that project or plan create different strategies. Every case is specific.

Power insists on *continuity*. Genocide is never an incident but a *continuous destruction*.

Melson talks about the *length of exposure to an extreme situation*.

Genocide is a crime of state (state crime)

Helen Fein speaks of five conditions that are *preconditions* for talking about *genocidal politics determined at state level*.

Genocidal politics:

- *Continuity of attack*. Genocide can be stopped in all eight phases, it is stoppable on every level. The denial of genocide as the last eighth phase is always the strategy of the state. Denial is also a possible evidence that genocide occurred.
- *The perpetrator is collective and organized*.
- *Victims are selected* because they are *members of a certain group*.
- *Victims are helpless*, they are *murdered regardless of their surrender or resistance*.
- *Destruction* is committed with the *intention to kill*. *The perpetrator decides on the killing*.

The difference between a war crime and genocide is determined based on the punishment and the ideology.

First: does the community in whose name genocide was committed distance itself from the genocide through punishment, via international criminal law?

Second: is the ideology that allowed that to happen still alive after the genocide? Are there trials and are prominent people publicly distancing themselves? Distancing doesn't necessarily have to be limited to law. It should be public and available.

In Argentina during the trial of general Videla, a member of the military junta and the de facto president of Argentina during the dictatorship, the transcript of the trial published the next day and the circulation of those newspapers was around 50000. The number of victims in Argentina still vary depending on the source. The state Commission created at the request of president Raul Alfonsin in nine months reached a number of almost 10000

names of victims and evidences that murders were committed. The Mothers of the Plaza de Mayo tell of 60000 victims. Argentinian police sources speak of 500 victims. The investigation about the missing people took place at the insistence of the civil society. December the 10th 1983 is considered the International day of the fight against crimes that the state commits against its own citizens. There was a political will in Argentina for that to be done. The Parliament formed the National Commission on the Disappearance of Persons at the request of the democratically elected president of Argentina , Raul Alfonsin (Alfnsin). It is important to break the zones of silence after such a trauma. Those zones are different for the perpetrators, the victims, the bystanders and the rescuers (saviors.)

Perpetrators are silent because they are afraid that they will be arrested, tried and convicted and because they have the need to normalize their lives after the crime. They always have a selective memory that helps them stay 'normal' after the crime, so they remember only their good deeds if they have any but not the crimes that they have committed, and even if they do remember it was done to 'defend their people', to 'fight against communism, Bolsheviks, non-believers etc', or they were only 'doing their duty'.

Why are victims silent? Because they are ashamed of being deeply dehumanized, they have the need to 'normalize their lives', they are silent out of shame for surviving, because they feel guilty that they couldn't protect those closest to them, helpless family members and relatives, women, children and the elderly.

The largest percentage of those who are silent are the bystanders (spectators), they are the most numerous. They keep silent because they don't want to open the moral question about whether they could have done something to stop the crime instead of doing nothing.

The rescuers(saviors) and those fighting in the resistance that step out of the bystander position often remain within the same context that made the crime possible and they can't speak because they are afraid.

Zones of silence are often transgenerational which doesn't mean that trauma doesn't exist or that it doesn't 'work' if it isn't spoken of.

The report of the Argentine Commission was published under the title 'Never Again'/'Nunca Mas' and it's one of the best-selling and most read reports on human rights in the world. The Commission had a limited time to work - nine months. The President of the Commission was Ernesto Sabato, an Argentinian writer and physicist, once a collaborator with the Curie family in Paris and winner of the Nobel Prize (prize) in literature.

After the report of the Commission was adopted in the Parliament of Argentina, Videla, Viola and Galtieri, the generals and members of the military junta, were tried. The army then tried a putsch in one barrack, but the then unarmed citizens surrounded the barracks and stopped the military rebellion. Nevertheless, *The Law of Due Obedience, Ley de obediencia debida* was passed then, pardoning all ranks lower than colonel (general), with the explanation that all lower ranks had to obey orders.

Ideologies

Ideologies live much longer than regimes and courts and perpetrators and victims. It becomes dangerous when the ideologies of killing and death are vital because they legitimize and make genocide possible. In Serbia it is the ideology of the eternal victim that was created on two of the most powerful traumas: the Battle of Kosovo and Jasenovac, that have never worked through (been passed). There are also traumas of the backyard psychology (psychology of the backyards) of great empires: The Ottoman Empire, The Austro-Hungarian Empire, fascist, communist and now the EU.

These transgenerational traumas need hard and serious work to work through (pass through) it and be freed from the trauma.

During the genocide one side is *the side of the perpetrator, armed and organized to use force*, and the other is *the side of the victim, unorganized and unarmed. That is the case of asymmetric power*. It's clearly visible in many situations, in the Warsaw Ghetto for instance. The balance of power is important in the strength and amount of arms. The extent of violence is an important question in the genocidal process. The extent of violence and military organization is extremely unequally distributed and concentrated on the side of the perpetrator.

Crisis, destabilization, disorientation, radical solutions

Genocide happens in conditions of serious long term and widespread crisis. That's when the need to find the *other* who is to blame for everything bad that is happening to us. There has never been a genocide that occurred in normal situations. Crisis is a precondition. Genocide never happens suddenly like an eruption, it is a process, not an event, a process that doesn't appear unexpectedly, all at once and spontaneously. Genocide happens only in situations of the most serious social and political (state) crisis.

It's the deepest economic and political crises that make genocide possible. In the time of crisis the state begins to function badly. The military and paramilitary have a monopoly on violence. With the growth of political and economic difficulties, problems multiply, and the ability of the state to solve them decreases. That brings about *destabilization*. The state of crisis leads to the state of destabilization. It manifests itself as an even more severe growing struggle for political positions and power of the political elite, the parties and social groups. It manifests itself in forms of political violence, like terrorism, political murders etc. Tension rises, pressure, insecurity and fear. Fascism and every totalitarianism are based on fear and manipulation. Fear of the very state to attack instead of protect. For most of the population, the development of crisis leads to a growing insecurity. In Vojvodina for instance 200000 mostly non-Serbian citizens fled the country between 1991 and 1999, and that's 10% of the population. Economic problems, growing unemployment, being left without an income, growing fear of a loss of property, are all conditions that lead from destabilization to disorientation when one becomes easy prey for manipulation.

More and more people are becoming susceptible to easy, quick and radical solutions. People are becoming susceptible to radical political ideas propagated by the radical elite.

When the majority of the population, and not just a small group, takes on the radical political ideas of that elite, then that majority voluntarily, democratically chooses that radical elite.

The radical and radicalized political elite reaches to the top and is in the position to make important state decisions in the distribution of goods. That is very important. On the state level, the elite can shift into a dictatorship through corruption and use the state's resources to achieve its own political goals.

Genocide is a political goal. Genocidal politics is always decided at the highest level of state. Politicians don't commit crimes themselves. Genocidal politics is determined at the highest state levels. That's the top-down process. It always starts at the state top. Genocidal politics is determined at the highest level of such a state and the decisions are made at the highest level. Genocide isn't a spontaneous eruption of a common hatred that lasted a long time, but are formed and supported by the ideologies in certain conditions. Genocide doesn't happen out of old bad emotions that the state cannot control. The state can control it if there is a political will. Genocide always happens with the knowledge, involvement and blessings of state institutions.

Five phases that lead to the process of genocide:

- *Defining the target group. The group must be marked, recognizable*
- *Property is taken away from the group*
- *The group has to be concentrated*
- *The group has to be deported*
- *A significant number in the group must be killed*

The highest state structures are responsible for what happens during the genocidal process, because of their active participation in the process. They are also responsible for the planning and the active implementation, the secret and silent conspiracy, they are also responsible if they knew and did nothing to stop it.

Genocide is not a solitary event, it doesn't occur on its own, it's a process that doesn't happen in a single time and place - it's different actions with participants that are connected as individuals in a collective form. They are interconnected. The planning and the executing are fragmented and that's why intent is hard to prove.

They are the ones who decide when the genocidal politics begins. They are not incidents or accidental crimes. Genocide is created by a decision of the central political leadership located at the state top. Decisions are made verbally, but the language of the perpetrators can vary. Written documents about those decisions are hard to find, they use a hidden language, difficult to prove.

The group that will be attacked is determined in the plan. There is a tendency to free 'us' from 'them'. Planning and preparation begin after a political decision. Planning develops from an idea in time and includes cooperation and competition.

For instance, when the The Khmer Rouge took over Phnom Penh in April 1975, the number of murders rose in Phnom Penh, but was smaller in the rural areas. And in the time of the most vicious events there were still factions in the structure of the government, it's not all black and white. The perpetrators are not a homogeneous group. Every agent of the genocidal process has their own autonomy that leads to cooperation or conflict. In Cambodia the intellectual elite of The Khmer Rouge was killed after 1975, because there was a strong anti-intellectualism present - the elimination of all educated people and purges even within The Khmer Rouge.

Plans develop via learning by doing (through practice). Perpetrators go further and further in their cruelty, step by step in order to achieve their goals selecting the methods, keeping only those who are successful and rejecting those who are not.

Genocidal politics are prepared, organized and coordinated

The career of a perpetrator? They start off doing small felonies and then continue further into crime. With every step further their chances of returning to a normal life gets smaller or is impossible. Cruelty is practiced and learned. That's how at one point in the genocidal process *the killing becomes a routine for the perpetrators*. Genocidal processes have never ended on their own, but always through outside intervention, because the contamination of the community that did it is too great.

The division of labor among the perpetrators: at the top are the ones who make decisions, they don't participate in the execution, but they do take part in the preparations and the thinking process. They rule from a distance. They determine the directive, make the manipulation of the international community possible, they control the money flow. The budget of Republika Srpska was 96% from Serbia, and 98% of that budget was for the army. Influential people form the public opinion. Public radical ideological statements play a big part in everything that happens during genocidal crimes. The perpetrators on various levels are connected and share the same intention to flee the "undesirables" ('undesireables'). That demands an organization of higher government. The organization of violence is not enough for genocide to occur. Without an ideology it's not possible. The ideology has an enormous role in the genocidal process, it is the causal force for it to happen. Radical nationalistic ideologies first diagnose the situation of crisis, destabilization and disorientation. The enemy is defined and is very negative, responsible for what is happening to us. That's the locating of the scapegoat.

The next step of radical nationalistic ideologies is giving therapy for such a condition. For instance, our nation will be saved from those evils if everyone dedicates themselves to that nationalistic goal, if the nation cleanses itself from foreign elements. When the inner and outer enemies are defeated then we have a homogeneous cultural identity, a monolithic identity crisis. Nationalism strongly simplifies and is militant and militarized (Herbert Marcuse). It is directed against 'the others', based on 'our unjust losses, our eternal position as victims', and that's how the potential for violence is maintained. It will

be worse unless we all unite and dedicate ourselves to the fight against others. Those others that need to be destroyed must be the personification of every awful thing that exists in order to be dehumanized, and once dehumanized we have no problem with killing them. Those dehumanized don't deserve our protection as human beings and must be disconnected, terrorized, have their property taken from them, driven off and in the end killed.

Why is someone a perpetrator? They are sadist, that's how they are called. But not all of them. They are ordinary people. As a category they are not homogeneous, they are different. There are extreme people who are true believers, that believe that their actions are just and good. In the Armenian genocide the perpetrators were extreme Turkish nationalists. The perpetrators are also those who will benefit in wealth and status, but have no ideological beliefs. They are also people who want to save their jobs. People who are deeply programmed to be obedient and just follow orders. It's also those who want to exercise their power on others. It is also those who want to make a career. Also adventurers. It's people who have no choice, who were drafted but didn't want to go. It's not the same degree of participation among the perpetrators, *they don't all participate in the same way*. In Cambodia there was an extreme egalitarian model, no one had the right to a different education, property and enjoyment by law. Even in that extreme case the perpetrators were not a homogeneous group.

Victims - This model was based on four case studies: the Armenian genocide, the Holocaust, autogenocide in Cambodia and Rwanda . Genocidal campaigns against the Armenians began in 1915. - *the victims had to be collectively guilty and proclaimed deadly* to the Ottoman Empire. A political culprit was found for that. If we don't kill them they will kill us. They have a secret wish to rule over us Turks, they want sovereignty and to destroy our country. They cannot do that and we won't let them. That is why they are dangerous to us. They got richer while we got poorer. Old prejudices are important. They are ready to conspire against us, they cannot be trusted. They are infidels because they are Christians. They are so limited that they are not human beings. They are the targeted group. *The group is always sensitive and vulnerable; a strong group is never attacked*. Vulnerability of the group can be the main reason for it being chosen.

Victims are helpless and they cannot defend themselves. Through violence, through the steps and the process of violence victims become even more vulnerable, even less capable of defending themselves. The vulnerable group is chosen. The chosen victim becomes such through the process. The effect of surprise is important.

The Armenian elite was killed in one night (24 April 1915) in Constantinople , when several thousand people were murdered. The process develops further. The process of destruction lasts until the end. The intention is hidden until the end.

There are three ways for victims to defend themselves. First by hiding and fleeing, then by resisting, fighting and finally adjusting as best they can to the fast and drastic change. The one who can adjust to those new life conditions can survive. The banality of indifference is an important question, as well as the line between hate speech and hate silence. Every trauma creates different zones of silence, which make it possible to reoccur if the trauma isn't passed. What isn't discussed and what cannot be described with

words. The energies of death are difficult. Silence is transgenerational. Our approach in the course 'War crimes, genocide and memories: The roots of evil, I want to understand' is titled 'listen/speak/think/build trust' and was created based on the decade-long work of Dan Bar-On, an Israeli psychologist and on of the directors of my course, with the second generation after the Holocaust with the children of Nazi perpetrators and the children of Holocaust survivors (surviving Jews). It is the TRT method, to reflect and trust. My method is listen/talk, based on my own, now a decade-long work with the survivors of the genocide in Bosnia and Herzegovina .

The film S 21 The Khmer Rouge Death Machine by Cambodian director Rithy Panh from 2003 was shown, running time 101 minutes

Impressions about the film:

Ljupka: The sickness holds us in thoughts not emotions. The film teaches us about the degrees of dehumanization, how a crime is produced. The film should be educational material. People should know and learn about it. Maybe the context would enable us to distance ourselves.

Svetlana: The victim and the perpetrator were in the same place without judgment. The torturer still hasn't left that role, that's how much he was one with his role. The mother wanted him to redeem himself for it. He spoke only of his own emotions and not of the people he killed.

Nataša: The film isn't lacking in context, it's informative but not necessary. The essence is how to get to the point when someone from here would talk about it. We need to know not only what happened but also why.

Marijana: Only one perpetrator says that he's ashamed and sorry. No one else says that. One said his head hurts.

Ervina: The process is saying I'm sorry. We see that the lives of the perpetrators were destroyed.

Marija: In order to make a moral choice I need to be a free person. They were not free.

Ivana: I found it was missing the context. That story repeats itself: prison, torturer, prisoners. It's always the same. The situation in which people become torturers should be stopped.

Edvin: I would compare the prison to three prisons in Bosnia and Herzegovina : the concentration camps Luka and Omarska and the battery factory in Srebrenica. In the Hague Tribunal we have Drazen Erdemovic and Franc Kos in front of the court of Bosnia and Herzegovina, neither of them ashamed. They shot/executed people from Srebrenica. The problem is in those countries where nobody talks about it, like Chechnya and Palestine .

Aleksandra: The film was difficult, it draws me into the story too much, and I can't react. The mechanism should be studied more than the details. Before they kill them they kill everything human in them and I find that horrible.

Valentina: The film is incredible because it has all the elements. It should be viewed carefully. It's irrelevant where it takes place. The feeling that we couldn't cry or get angry is terrifying.

Miloš: The guards see themselves as victims - I found that strange. We didn't hear what would have happened to them if they had refused. The guards are victims of a totalitarian system. It's easy for a painter to question them, we don't know how he would behave in their place in that situation. It's wrong to ask them why it happened.

Miloš U.: I am sad and it's hard for me that the political category wasn't included in the Convention. It was an alibi for communist regimes around the world to commit mass murder. We should remember the genocide by hunger in Ukraine when seven million people were killed, the deportation of the people from Caucasus to the steppe of Central Asia, 10% of the population was killed in each of these cases, there was a leap into death during the Cultural revolution in China .

Snežana: It's important for me to know what's going on in every part of the planet. It's important for me to know all the specifics of this evil. The process of catharsis with the perpetrators begins with the family.

Ivana: The film was difficult.

Cambodia - autogenocide

The genocide in Cambodia shows that the genocidal model is the same almost everywhere. The first impression about Cambodia created by the colonizers and the local royal elite is that they are peaceful peasants, poor but satisfied, happy nonviolent Buddhists. The French colonization lasted from 1863 to 1954. Cambodia was under occupation of Vietnam since 1820 to 1830. Their royal family had the position of god with authoritarian structures of belief and was very poor during the Vietnamese rule.

The continuity of violence in Cambodia

After the end of WWII a peasant movement developed called Issarak/The Free that fought against colonialism and the monarchy. The freeing from colonialism came from that movement. Social distance in Cambodia was extreme and brutal. The main division was between the peasants and the urban elite. Their elite called the peasants 'dogs', 'filthy animals', 'disgusting'. The division was visible in the behavior of people. Issarak would examine people's palms. If someone had gentle hands instead of rough ones they'd be killed instantly. Extreme anti-intellectualism was against the elite. They catch all the teachers in some province and kill them all. They bring them to the edge of a cliff and throw them over. Because of great taxes and imposts that the peasants had to pay they went into large debts and had to sell their land and leave for Phnom Penh . The

population grew from 600.000 in 1968 to three million in 1975 when the city was occupied by the Khmer Rouge. A peasant uprising began in 1967/8 in one province, before the Khmer Rouge, against great taxes. Lon Nol, general and prime minister, sent a punitive expedition to pacify the peasants by killing them. In three years about 10.000 peasants were murdered. The USA began the bombing of Cambodia in 1968. Three million tons of bombs were dropped on Cambodia, as part of the fight against communism. The Viet Cong had its bases there. The Khmer Rouge joined the fight in 1968. Phnom Penh was lost on April 17th 1975 and the Khmer Rouge came into power for the next four years, until 1979. Around two million people lost their lives during their rule. That's a quarter of the population, killed directly through starvation, evacuated from the cities, murdered by officers without a trial, intellectuals, systemically, on a large scale, as enemies of the revolution that had total egalitarianism as its goal. Education was abolished as well as money. They were working on that egalitarian project in which everyone would be the same and there would be no difference among people. Who created that ideology? The intellectuals of the Khmer Rouge who studied in Paris. Pol Pot, the political leader of the Khmer Rouge also studied in Paris, but he had (ad) mediocre results during his studies, he was stupid and cruel.

The International Court for Cambodia was established in 2003. It's a combination of Cambodian judiciary and that of the UN. The genocide in Cambodia ended with the intervention caused by pressures from China, USA and Vietnam. The Khmer Rouge retreated to the north and they weren't tried. From 2003 until 2007 there was not a single case in that court. Khieu Samphan and Pol Pot are dead but others are being processed. The need of the victims to discover what happened doesn't expire with the death of the perpetrators. The case of Cambodia was an autogenocide (*autogeocide*) because the Khmer Rouge killed people of their own nationality. The greatest number of victims was from the same people, the Khmer. There were 158 prison centers, 309 located mass graves and 76 post-genocide monuments raised to the memory of the genocide victims.

Experiences of long term destabilization, extreme violence, hunger, killing was a precondition for that to happen. The number of people involved and supporting the regime was too great and that was the problem. It was impossible to try them all and it didn't happen in Europe.

Bystanders

What are bystanders? (Answers of participants) 'Spectators'. 'Silent majority'. 'Those who are there but on the sidelines'. 'Passive majority'. The very word expresses the complexity of that category. It cannot be described or told of with words. It is an expression for people who stand passively in extreme situations and do nothing. Some risk their lives to help, some become paralyzed, and some run in fear. People react differently to extreme situations and both individually and collectively. Kitty Genovese was a woman who was raped in broad daylight, her screams were heard by the neighbors but nobody came to help or called for help. It is the banality of indifference that grows. That kind of behavior, the behavior of bystanders in extreme situations has no legal consequences. The people who could have done something but didn't cannot be processed under current laws. The relationship toward them started to change after the Holocaust through demands for compensation. There are already requests to make the behavior of spectators not only a

moral but a legal category that could be processed if you had the power to react but didn't.

Yasushi Akashi, a high ranking UN official had the power to do something in Srebrenica but did nothing. If you had the power and the responsibility, but did nothing, maybe people will create laws to make those criminally responsible.

When we speak about bystanders my approach is not to talk about the type of person, but the behavior caused by the situation. That is situational behavior, not a character trait. There are different levels of bystander behavior, three types: low, middle and high. At the highest level nothing more can be done. How many bystanders must there be for one man to be killed? It's at least ten, but since the Holocaust that number is growing (Dan Bar - On & Janja Beč). *Not even the bystanders are a homogeneous category*. The number of spectators for every person killed anywhere in the world is growing.

In his book 'Roots of Evil', Ervin Staub opened the question why we as human beings behave in such a way and not offer help in extreme situations and what happens that we become rescuers (saviors) or fighters in the resistance.

Bystanders in the Holocaust (Dan Bar-On) and Srebrenica (Janja Beč)

1.) *Opportunist Bystanders- Young industrial entrepreneurs*, those who during Hitler's Germany had the feeling that that was the right moment to start a business. They had no problem with employing people into forced labor. After the war, in the context of the Cold War, they were forgiven for everything in the name of the fight against communism. They have a profit from it. They use a robbed Jewish factory and have no problems with it. After the Holocaust they want to collaborate with Israeli companies. In Yu-wars robbery was committed through war. There was no resistance to the opportunistic elite, no strikes. The military, police, religious, industrial, media elite blocked it here in Serbia .

2.) *Street Bystanders* - during the time of Hitler they got jobs, and with bread swallowed everything else. They believed that Hitler was the solution to all problems. There were a million people on Gazimestan. That's when the war began with the support of this people. This region hasn't overcome trauma for centuries. They piled up, were suppressed, weren't spoken about. Unprocessed trauma can be encouraged, Trauma lasts as long as it hurts. It's over when it doesn't hurt anymore. War lasts as long as it hurts. It's important to talk about trauma in patriarchal cultures of being silent. Serbia is a patriarchal society, traumas are not talked about. Serbia is a peasant society. In peasant societies nothing changes for centuries, including the silence after a trauma. Serbia has no continuous elite. It has the backyard psychology (psychology of the backyard) of great empires. The position of victim hasn't changed. To move away from it you have to be successful. Traumas are either encouraged or blocked for centuries, in accordance with the opportunities and needs.

In his book "Fascism & Democracy in the Human Mind" (*Democratically against the fascist mind*.) Israel W. Charny distinguishes between the democratic and

the fascistic mind: the democratic mind implies complexity, nothing is black and white, while the fascistic mind is black and white, the democratic mind develops solutions, values knowledge, gives opportunities for choosing between different options, the possibility of dialogue, while the fascistic mind wants solutions now is anti-intellectual, intolerant to different opinions and options. The democratic mind accepts responsibility, doesn't see itself as a constant victim, the fascistic mind always sees itself as the victim and never accepts responsibility neither individual or collective. The third criteria is love and respect for life of the democratic mind, and the destruction and dislike for life of the fascistic one.

3.) *Ideologically oriented bystanders* - doctors in the Holocaust were of the elite educated on the theory of racial purity. A lot of doctors participated in the euthanasia program, in which around 60000 people were killed. They destroyed their humanity so it was possible to kill them. That was the law, there were procedures for people who weren't worthy of living. That was the politics of destroying the weak and the different. When relatives became suspicious that they were murdered, then a great part was played by the protestant clergy that spoke up and that program of racist hygiene was stopped before WWII.

Here we are reminded of some of our doctors and the roles that they played. First of all Radovan Karadzic. The sudden social promotion with great leaps brings destabilization. His personality, from a brutally poor family traumatized by war, with a sudden promotion, couldn't bear it, he cracked. Several defendants of ICTY are doctors: Milomir Stakic, Milan Kovacevic, Radovan Karadzic. They did get a high education in the time of free schooling in socialism, but they maintained a system of values that solves problems by force.

4.) *Career Bystanders* – people from the university, the art world, they keep silent. They know, but they are building a career. By definition they are obligated to open moral questions. They are not all the same, there was a minority that protested, but it was insignificant. The elite that had to react was silent for various reasons: fear, social and professional promotion, concrete material gain etc. A lot of those people left the university and the art world. When professional (ecological) niches are left empty they are filled from the bottom up.

5.) *Institutionalized- rational bystanders*– the one who knows what's going on, but says nothing. The clergy falls into this category. Edith Stein tried to oppose, and was instantly sent to the gas chamber.

6.) *The Professional Bystanders* – experts who worked on the production of Zyklone B for the gas chambers during the Holocaust. People knew who they were, but they went on with it. That was their profession.

7.) Professional, but more “enlightened one”, less career oriented –*Architects*, the ones who built everything needed for the concentration camps. They projected the gas chambers. For them it was only a mathematical calculation.

8.) *Distant Bystanders* - the ones who are not present at an event but know about it. They are far away. We are spectators from a distance if we knew and could have done something about it. Why didn't they pressure their countries to bomb railways that lead to Auschwitz and other concentration camps? They didn't care.

9.) *Other-hating Bystanders* – because they are different. They are receptive to messages from authorities, the military, police, and religious first of all. When the war ended, the peasants from the vicinity of Auschwitz that saw what happened, that heard, that knew, would get angry after the war when people came to visit Auschwitz. They are still angry today.

10.) *Emotionally related Bystanders* – women, children, parents of the perpetrators. They think that their relatives are wonderful creatures incapable of committing acts of evil, good people who have been unjustly accused. I would say that most people in Serbia fall into this category, that relate to the perpetrators as if they are their own children, brothers, husbands.

In the fourth group are the rescuers (*saviors*). At some point someone from the bystanders becomes active. Active help or, on a higher scale, fighting. My grandfather used to hide Jews, communists and partisans, but he wasn't a fighter. My grandfather was discovered and killed in a concentration camp in Zemun, while my mother and her sisters became partisans. Women in Black are in this category - the saviors.

Holocaust in the Balkans

Slovenia: the Jewish community was almost completely destroyed.

Serbia: concentration camps Sajmiste/Semlin in Zemun under the command of the SS. Around 10000 to 13000 Jews from Belgrade were killed there. Serbia was the first in Europe to 'solve' the Jewish question. Many Jews lost their lives in Jabuka near Pancevo. In March 1942 in Belgrade Zyklon B was tested in a bus called *dusegupka*. The drivers knew what they were doing so they had psychological problems, they started drinking. The work was done by night to keep it a secret. People tried to run from there which lead to trucks being overturned so screams could be heard. From 1942 when there were no more Jews, communists were held in Sajmiste, partisans and antifascists from Italy and Greece . It's estimated that around 40000 to 100000 people went through that camp, the number is not determined.

Croatia: the final solution to the Jewish question was executed in Jesenovac. Apart from Jews, Serbs, Roma and communists were killed there. In Croatia between 30000 and 39000 Jews lost their lives. In Dubrovnik in 1941 the Jewish population had 87 members in the ghetto. Then the number rose to 1800. Anti-Jewish laws were applied, property was confiscated. Italian authorities did help the Jews to survive.

Bosnia and Herzegovina: the Wehrmacht entered Sarajevo on April 16th 1941. The Jewish community in Sarajevo was Sephardi and numbered 14000, of which 10000 lived in Sarajevo . Over 10000 were killed. The Jerusalem mufti Amin al-Husseini supported the final solution to the Jewish question.

Albania i Kosovo: many Jews survived in Albania and Kosovo. In Albania the Jews were helped by ordinary people. Families took in refugees.

Bulgaria: 80% of Jews survived in this country.

Going through trauma - the model of Dan Bar-On

1. Knowledge of what happened, when it happened, who were the perpetrators, who were the victims and who the bystanders
2. Context – historical, religious, psychological etc.
3. Strong emotional reaction from one side
4. Strong emotional reaction from the other side
5. Freeing from trauma

Reconciliation (Conciliation)? – Healing?

In Judaism the perpetrator approaches the victim and says I did it, I am sorry and asks can you forgive me or not. Then the victim says I can or I cannot. Reconciliation (Conciliation) is a Christian term and it doesn't exist in Judaism or Islam, they use the term healing. Only the victim can forgive. The word reconciliation (conciliation) doesn't exist in Islam. In Guatemala and Cambodia that word doesn't exist, the word in use is healing by working through trauma (passing through trauma). Criminal justice is necessary, but social justice is important as well.

Zones of silence

Every conflict creates zones of silence: the silence of bystanders, victims, perpetrators and rescuers (saviors). Bystanders are silent for moral reasons. They don't have to fear responsibility. Their moral dilemma is whether or not they could have done something. 80% of them didn't help but have the need for normalization so they try to pass off normalization as normalcy. The perpetrators have a selective memory in order to survive emotionally and regain their humanity in spite of the inhumane acts that they had committed. Perpetrators are silent because they don't want to be tried, arrested, convicted or held criminally responsible. It's a paradoxical double moral of the perpetrator. Forgetting the bad things that they did, they remember only the good. Victims are silent because they are ashamed for being so dehumanized, they are silent because they didn't protect their weak, children and parents, because they survived and the others were killed. That's the guilt of the survivors. They feel guilty because they survived. Rescuers (Saviors) are silent out of fear if the ideology and context haven't changed, and they can last longer than the trauma.

Forms of denial

The denial of genocide is always the strategy of the state and its institutions. Like genocide, it is a top-down process coming from the highest levels of government. Genocide is an eight step process. The last step is denial. There are 12 forms of denial.

1. *The number of victims* - the game of numbers has several purposes. The number rises or falls depending on the purpose.
2. *Moral disqualification of witnesses* - the humanity and moral credibility of witnesses is questioned. Disqualification is executed through staged and intentionally placed stories.
3. *Claims that the deaths were unintentional* - it happened by accident, there was hunger, those were the times, it was war and these things happen in war. It's the fault of the international community for not helping enough.
4. *Emphasizing strange habits of the victims* - they are infidels, primitive tribes, of another race, that's them, and this is us, we are not like them.
5. *The rationalization of killing* - as a tribal conflict. It's an old conflict, our culture. On the other hand, history doesn't confirm it. Arabs and Blacks didn't kill each other in Darfur until the government of Sudan didn't start arming paramilitary groups.
6. *Some forces got out of control* - some groups that we couldn't control. This claim isn't true because there is no later distancing from those groups, instead they are hidden, protected and financially helped.
7. *Frightening diplomats* - if the international diplomacy interferes, war will break loose. So diplomats are frightened. They ignore that it's a matter of serial killers. In the cases of genocide pardoning of serial killers leads to a new genocide.
8. *Justification of denial because of economic interests*
9. *They were treated well* - they are in concentration camps, but they are treated well. Imagination is limitless here.
10. *Definitionalists* - in the first place lawyers who avoid even the first letter of genocide to evade intervention
11. *Accusing the victims* - genocide is presented as a civil war. Everybody is killing everyone and nobody is guilty. Victims themselves are guilty; they were arming themselves and making secret plans. Genocide nevertheless happens only in war. War is legalized killing.
12. *Peace and reconciliation are more important than accusing people* - these are excuses that aim to pardon the perpetrators

International criminal courts

The international community wasn't ready for a military intervention in Bosnia and Herzegovina , and only because of the huge pressure placed by the international public was the ICTY established on May 25th 1993, as a response of the international community to do anything to stop the genocide in Bosnia and Herzegovina that began in the spring of 1992. ICTY was the first international court that wasn't military and the first one to be established as such.

ICTY was formed after several attempts by the international community to create it: Leipzig and Ankara after WWI, Nuremberg and Tokyo after WWII, informal courts like the Russell Tribunal (for Vietnam) and female courts and female tribunals (Lahore , Tokyo ...).

ICTY was established as a trade 'amnesty for peace'. That trade was opposed by the Supreme Court Justice of South Africa and the first prosecutor for ICTY, Richard Goldstone, which formed the foundation of this court based on justice as a precondition for peace.

After that ICTR, the court for Rwanda , was established, and the hybrid (local and international) tribunals for Cambodia , Sierra Leone and East Timor . ICC, The International Criminal Court was established after that. The first prosecutor was Luis Moreno Ocampo from Argentina , the assistant prosecutor in the case of the general in the Argentine military junta Videla. The new prosecutor is Fatou Bensouda from Gabon , Africa .

The film Living monument from 2012, by Ines Tanovic, a director from Bosnia and Herzegovina was shown (38min running time)

Impressions about the film:

Svenka: I liked the film. We are united by the same evil. In the film you can't tell who is who. Our common nature unites us. At the confession, all these stories are told and already worn out. That extent of the already told bothers me. You have a speech but create so much evil that you cannot express it in words.

Ljupka: I would like to be quiet but I have to react. The stories are authentic. And they can only be told through repetition. Physical pain visible on trembling faces, those spasms, comes from the attempt to control emotions I think.

Staša: It's mentioned too rarely compared to the extent of the horror. There is an asymmetry of memory between victims and executioners. One woman from Kozaac told us: 'If I hadn't spoken about it I would have died'. I know who is of what nationality even though it's not obvious in the film.

Lepa: Every time I listen to this I understand how much more I still have to hear. I like the contrast between the nature and the story. I like the portraits at the end.

Ervina: It's clearly about Bosnia , even though the nationality is subtle. I know that there were both perpetrators and victims.

Snežana: If they have the courage to talk about the evil that happened to them, we have to have even more courage to hear it.

Ivana: The film is excellent, very well made, clean and minimalist. The stories are moving and strong. They were able to tell the story. The man cried, the women didn't.

Nada: Their faces talk to us. Evil retold many times helps you get over it, or makes it harder, I wonder. Those who should be facing it are not.

Marijana: The film is excellent and it shook me up. I know one of those people. He was in a concentration camp until they transferred him to Uzice for medical treatment. A doctor saved him. He had a great need to talk about that man, as if he wanted to comfort me.

Marija: The film is terribly emotional, and that scares me. I fell apart, and I don't like things that hit so directly. Too much emotion can be abused. The film is pure emotion but I have to deal with the causes of the war.

Valentina: I am missing names in the film, because the victims had names, they became victims because of their names.

Janja: It goes straight to the eyes, then to the brain then to the heart. That's how it is with this film as well. It goes directly to your emotions, it's more open than a book.

Aleksandra: I like documentaries, but they should be taken in small doses. You have to become indifferent in order to handle them.

PRESENTATIONS BASED ON THE READER TEXTS

Aleksandra: I liked the text about the bystanders the most.

Staša: Lemkin moved and touched me deeply. He unites what I learn, feel, think and do. I identified with him. Combining the fight for a common good of mankind and Lemkin's burnout saddened me. His humanity was touching. It's very moving. I remembered us.

Nada: I also liked the text about Lemkin. That's when I paused. When the bridges were destroyed in Novi Sad, my father cried. He cried for the bridges. War ends where it began.

Ervina: Lemkin was chosen because he cried. I liked his persistence. It's very important to think about people and the world. I identified with the loneliness of the whole story.

Ljupka: I liked two texts the most: Rape and the Creation of a national soldier and Border and no man's land. There is no adequate answer in psychology for prevention.

Marijana: I wanted to choose the text by Javier Aguirre that I found very difficult, but I changed my mind. I decided to pick the text by Janja Bec 'From hate speech to hate silence - the banality of indifference'. The suffering of victims should be acknowledged, to say I know, I'm sorry and I'm ashamed. It's important to feel other people. In 'Cracking of the soul' Nefa asks: 'are they sorry for us as well?' That is the main thing.

Ivana: The text 'Stopping war crimes and genocide' is the one I chose. There is an idea of a collective future as a prevention. Dealing with the past without a vision of the future is a painful experience.

Edin: I like the text about Lemkin. I'm glad that you included Kljuc. Lemkin spent his entire life for the good of the society and the community.

Valentina: Raphael Lemkin was an activist and he succeeded because he was persistent. However much we stop, we also move. It's better to be a foreigner than to have such deep roots that they paralyze you. I liked the text about the bystanders. I think that we are all bystanders sometimes. Our zones of silence are interesting. I'm looking for police practices that can be prevented.

Snežana: I chose the text Lemkin's law. He overcame inner indifference toward a visible evil.

Miloš U.: I like the negotiations for Cracking of the soul that Richard Goldstone and Aleksandar Tisma wrote. It's lovely and powerful. I love those sentences. Of all the stories from the book Cracking of the soul I like Hida and the sentence 'I am all covered in the blood of my daughters that fell in my lap'.

Miloš: I chose Jana's text 'The banality of indifference' because I find it intriguing. There are two reasons why it was interesting to me - because it's about my peers and because the relation I knew, 'I'm sorry, I'm ashamed' runs through this text, that hasn't been explained there either. It constantly deals with collective identities. I can't see it. That's not questioned. That's what bothers me. After genocide there is no 'but...' and I like everything to have a 'but'. I like god t have a 'but'. It's a dogmatic anti-intellectual attitude. I have no problems with 'i knew it', every one of us should say it in the end. It's decent to say it. But 'I'm sorry', there I sense the person saying it identifying with the aggressor. That bothers me. I cannot identify with the aggressor, because I am not an aggressor. That implies that we love nations. What about the people who don't love nations, the people who find them unimportant, people who think that they are the cause of all the problems. I am one of those people. And then I find forcing it into everything difficult. After this entire seminar I don't have the answer why I should say that I am sorry and ashamed. In the end this will sound like genocide denial because that's how it's all constructed. This falls into those 12 categories of denial. I deny genocide but only as a rational being asking for a clerification.

Marija: The text about Lemkin is important for our work. How international law happened to be formed. We deal with national identity and collective identities as if they are unquestionable. Conciliation on the national level is impossible. We have to step out of that particular identity. We never seem to reach the universal. I am a human being. I go in the name of a young political community. It's impossible for conciliation to come from a national collective. I can't come to terms with fixed identities

Lepa: I liked the text from Cracking of the soul 'Are they sorry for us'. I always kept coming across a consensus of silence. I like the story by Primo Levi, about how they couldn't listen to him because it was so hard. I work so that every one of us makes room

within herself to hear the other. That other cannot be free until I hear her. That is my political responsibility. To make room within ourselves to validate emotions to ourselves so that we can tell the other person that we know, that we are sorry and ashamed for what humanity has done. That is the feminist ethic of care. I have to think about myself, because as a member of the female gender I am not given to care for myself.

EVALUATION 1.33 the best mark is 1

The evaluation was done in two parts. The first part was verbal and public, people were supposed to express what they liked the most (two things) and the least (two things). After that there was a secret numerical evaluation. Parts of the school were marked by numbers. The total score was 1.33, with 1 being the best mark.

Nataša: It was an honor for me to work with the Women in Black. You are here because you wanted to be. We are a minority on a scale of a statistical error, but it's a joy to know that we exist. The level of honesty was high and that is very important. I didn't like how impatient we are.

Miloš U.: I liked the theoretical part the most and if I could I would do only that. I really had a desire for this to find out as much as I could about this topic. Thank you Janja for being here. The breaks could have been shorter.

Miloš: I liked that we had the reader so that we could prepare. I liked the films because I love a multidisciplinary approach.

Snežana: It was a privilege for me to be here and participate in the seminar. I liked everything, but most of all the text by Dan Bar-On. Your pointing out various authors who could help me understand genocide was important to me. Another thing I liked were the zones of silence of perpetrators, victims and bystanders.

Valentina: I expected to be set in motion again, and I was. I'm glad that I heard Falkone's name because he was a special person and part of my identity as an activist. It was an honor to be here.

Marijana: I liked the theoretical part, I enjoyed it and got clear answers. I liked everything. What I would want is a next level. To work at it deeper and more theory, because it's important. As activists we need a theoretical base. I liked the reader very much.

Marija: I can't answer in categories of what I liked and didn't like. I'd rather not be here. The bystanders disturbed me and that there is an intention to include them in criminal law. We are such an unempathetic and insensitive society that it has to be shoved into law. More laws means less justice. I didn't like the films.

Ivana: I enjoyed the theoretical part, it was interesting. You present it in such a lovely way, express yourself nicely. The films are good, they fit in well. At first it bothered me that we had to prepare something from the reader, but that turned out excellent.

Lepa: I am totally amazed. I learned so much these two days. My longing for knowledge was stimulated. Everything was excellently organized and prepared. Janja has a soft and gentle facilitation. It was very pleasant for me. I learned a lot from all of us. I am fascinated by everything and proud of the Women in Black. Next time we should agree on some working rules.

Staša: I would like to thank Janja, Natasa and Milos . I thank all of us. Our thirst for knowledge isn't stimulated by formal reasons but ethical principles of care for the world. This reminds me of food for the soul. As Marina Cvetajeva would say this is not a typical weekend. I thank all of us for supporting each other to reason together. That is our dignity - learning together. United production of knowledge is important to us. We should go to Kljuc together. Thank all of you who are at the Danube .

Edvin: It was important for me to theoretically study genocide, because it's important for us to know what it is so we don't manipulate that word. I think it's difficult to talk about Cambodia when we haven't solved the question of Bosnia and Herzegovina .

Nada: I learned a lot of new things. I liked everything. I didn't fall asleep reading the reader. I am yet going to study it. It was valuable to me that the Sophie Scholl school will continue its work in Serbia and Vojvodina. I have no complaints.

Aleksandra: I can't sit for long and I need more breaks. I am impressed by the amount of knowledge I received in these two days. And the reader was great. I was annoyed that someone would question us, but that was OK. I kept thinking about ecocide - the crime against nature. Genocide isn't just killing people, but killing living conditions. I didn't know about Cambodia but I was thrown into the discussion.

Janja: It was an honor to be here with you. You are here because you have the need to understand, to humanize relations, and for me that is the meaning of life. I am glad that you invited me, we did this together. My collaboration with Milos and Natasa in preparing this was exceptional. My suggestion would be to breathe life into the school and develop it further. Where people want to listen to us. Kljuc deserves a visit from us. We should see Biljane and Prhovo and Rubija and Hida. It means a lot. If we make within ourselves room for someone else then we have succeeded. Changing ourselves we are ready for other and different people. In his book 'The roots of Evil' Ervin Staub says that only by doing and changing ourselves and our environment can we make a difference. Women in Black, for twenty years persistently, in Belgrade and Serbia , patiently, with dignity, bravery, honestly, publicly change with their actions themselves and the environment that is a post-war one, post-genocidal and traumatized. That is the path of working through trauma (passing through trauma). It's the preventative against some other possible genocide. That is the way.

The report was prepared by Miloš Urošević with solidary support from Janja Bec