

CLOSING THE GAPS

Memory, Prevention and
Social Cohesion in Europe

Report of the
roundtable

Europe House
Sarajevo
24–25 March 2026

OCTOBER 2026 · PUBLISHED BY:



International Coalition of
SITES of CONSCIENCE



ICIP INTERNATIONAL
CATALAN
INSTITUTE
FOR PEACE

CLOSING THE GAPS MEMORY, PREVENTION AND SOCIAL COHESION IN EUROPE

In the decades following 1945, European states invested significantly in the building of official memory cultures, through state-sponsored commemorations, education, and memorialization. At the heart of the European Union's (EU) memory agenda lies a foundational belief: that a shared remembrance of Europe's violent past — centered above all on the Holocaust and the crimes of totalitarianism — could serve as the basis for building a strong and united Europe. Its identity would be rooted in this particular telling of the past, reflecting the joint aim of a post-war Europe living in a lasting peace and democratic integration, and helping to prevent the recurrence of such crimes.

Decades on, the gap between that ambition and the present reality is difficult to ignore. Memory frameworks that were designed to foster a common commitment to human dignity, the rule of law, and peaceful coexistence are showing profound limitations — and in some cases, producing effects that may even contradict their original purpose¹.

The hierarchization of memories — in which some histories receive sustained institutional attention and funding while others remain under-resourced or excluded — reproduces exclusion and historical inequalities and generates competition among communities seeking recognition. Identity-based approaches have also contributed to reinforcing this fragmentation by treating histories as separate, producing compartmentalized memory cultures that obscure the structural causes of violence and injustice they were intended to address. The result is a landscape of irreconcilable memory claims in which the collective reckoning becomes increasingly difficult, and solidarity across communities increasingly remote.

Memory is also more and more weaponized for political ends. Across Europe and beyond, historical narratives are selectively mobilized by political actors to consolidate power, sharpen identity-based divisions, and delegitimize opponents. Governments increasingly invoke historical grievances to reinforce monolithic national narratives and justify discriminatory policies, or use consecrated historical references to confer moral legitimacy on actions that contradict the very lessons of the past.

Finally, despite decades of investment in historical education, commemoration, and memorialization, the knowledge and empathy produced have not consistently translated into the capacity to recognize and resist present-day discrimination and violence. The rise of revisionism, hate speech, antisemitism, islamophobia, and all forms of xenophobia, discrimination and racism across Europe — and the repeated failure of the "never again" commitment in the face of Srebrenica, Rwanda and Gaza, among others — does not expose the lack of awareness but a structural failure of memory policies as a preventive tool.

It was to face these failures that victims and survivors, civil society actors and scholars, and policymakers gathered in Sarajevo on 24 and 25 March 2026. Closing the Gaps was a two-day roundtable hosted by the International Coalition of Sites of Conscience (ICSC), the War Childhood Museum (WCM), and the International Catalan Institute for Peace (ICIP). Participants came together to reflect critically on the challenges, examine the deeper structural reasons behind these failures, and identify what has proven effective and what lessons can be carried forward.

This report gathers the reflections, conversations and insights from those two days.

1 Gensburger, S. & Lefranc, S. (2020). *Beyond Memory: Can We Really Learn From the Past?* Springer Nature.

Personal Reflection

ALMA MUSTAFIĆ, SURVIVOR OF THE SREBRENICA GENOCIDE

Srebrenica, 1992. I remember thinking: Is there no one in the world who cares about us? Are they just going to let us be killed? How many children around the world are thinking the exact same thing right now?

“Never again” was a promise to me—my generation. We were supposed to be the first generation to grow up without war. It turned out to be a broken promise. At the age of 11, I faced the horror of war. I remember sitting in dark basements—the cold, the hunger, and the constant fear of shelling. Sometimes we sat there for hours, without food or water. We children sat in the middle of the shelter, with our parents around us. Only now do I realize that this was their way of protecting us from a direct hit.

After some time, the international community woke up and intervened, and Srebrenica was declared a UN safe area. The day the UN entered Srebrenica, we were all euphoric. Ever since the beginning of the war, my father had been saying that the world would not stand by and watch us be killed... And now, we believed we had been saved, but the worst was yet to come. With the arrival of UN troops, the shelling stopped and the situation improved somewhat. Humanitarian aid began to reach the starving population. We were no longer dying from hunger, lack of medicine, grenades or snipers.

And then Srebrenica fell. My father was murdered, like thousands of other men. Our fathers, brothers, grandfathers, uncles, cousins, and loved ones were systematically killed and placed in mass graves just because of who they were. I was deported, like thousands of other women and children.

Never again. How many times do we have to say “never again,” if every time it happens again, we look away? How many people around the world are thinking the exact same thing right now?

Last year, for the 30-year commemoration of the Srebrenica genocide, I collaborated with leading memory



organizations in the Netherlands on a multimedia project called 11 Voices of Srebrenica. It reached over three million people. But it was not only about Srebrenica voices; we used our voices to draw attention to what is going on in the world. Through projects like Dangerous Names and 11 Voices of Srebrenica, I have seen how memory can educate, connect, and mobilize people—even decades later.

Memory teaches us courage. The courage to speak when it is difficult. The courage to follow our moral compass. The courage to stand in solidarity with others. Real change happens when memory leads to action—through education, art and dialogue. When I am in doubt, I close my eyes and ask myself: What would 11-year-old Alma do? And I hear her voice: Is there anyone in the world who cares about us?

Today, I know there are many who care. But some are afraid to speak. I refuse to be one of them. I speak for that little girl in the basement. I speak for the children in Gaza. I speak for all those whose freedom is denied. Memory is not just something we preserve—but something we use. To act. To speak. To stand together.

Alma Mustafić, Survivor of the Srebrenica genocide, Lecturer and Researcher, Access to Justice, Utrecht University of Applied Sciences (the Netherlands)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report presents the key insights and recommendations emerging from the roundtable *Closing the Gaps* convened by the International Coalition of Sites of Conscience (ICSC), the War Childhood Museum (WCM), and the International Catalan Institute for Peace (ICIP), bringing together memory practitioners, civil society organizations, policymakers, and scholars to examine the role of memory work in building democratic resilience, advancing justice, and preventing violence.

Throughout this report, “European memory” is used as an analytical frame. The report does not treat Europe’s histories of violence, discrimination, and repression as interchangeable, nor does it flatten their distinct causes, actors, and legacies across countries and contexts. What it examines is a structural and historical problem common to memory policies and frameworks across Europe: how memory work is institutionalized, funded, governed, and mobilized politically, and the trends that recur across otherwise different national and regional contexts.

Participants identified five interconnected shifts the field must make.

From institutional bias to inclusive memory governance. European memory frameworks are not neutral. They reflect choices shaped by particular historical, political contexts and power relations, resulting in significant gaps in official commemorative culture. Building genuinely inclusive public memory requires more than adding marginalized perspectives to existing dominant frameworks — it demands reconsidering the architecture and central assumptions that determine what is remembered and who holds decision-making power, with affected communities participating as active agents rather than subjects consulted after decisions have been made. It also requires clarifying the goals of memorialization: “never again” must mean that, whoever the perpetrators or victims are, atrocity crimes shall never be committed; there shall be no double standards.

From passive remembrance to participatory and transformative memory. The dominant assumption — that emotional engagement with historical suffering naturally translates into changed behavior — is not borne out by evidence. The rise of denialism and revisionism across Europe after decades of Holocaust education, and the genocides in Srebrenica and Rwanda, which took place while “never again” commitments were being institutionalized, illustrate the limits of a model built on the assumption that transmission alone suffices. Transformative memory requires, among other things, meeting people where they are, embracing creative and

accessible formats, and making participation substantive rather than rhetorical.

From polarized or consensual memory to dialogic memory. Memory practice too often oscillates between two limiting approaches: polarized remembrance that weaponizes the past for present political conflict, and consensual “peace-washing” that may smooth over unresolved tensions in the name of reconciliation. In both approaches, memory is understood as a conclusion rather than a process. Dialogic memory — grounded in human rights principles, trauma-informed approaches, and honest engagement across difference — offers an alternative that acknowledges differences, and that seeks to rebuild trust and strengthen societal resilience.

From depoliticized remembrance to accountable memory. European memory policies have largely avoided the harder questions about root causes that enabled past violence — and that continue to operate in the present. Memory that avoids addressing root causes cannot prevent the recurrence of violence; it commemorates it. Accountable memory means understanding the root causes, identifying the responsibilities at all levels, and placing accountability at the core of the remembrance processes; and intersecting the memory work with broader struggles for anti-racism, decolonization, gender equality, and social justice.

From silos to integrated prevention frameworks. Memorialization remains largely confined to transitional justice frameworks and post-conflict settings. It is not included in ongoing domestic public policies to prevent violence, or in development programming. Operationalizing “never again” requires integrating memory into the architecture and policies of violence prevention. It means strengthening the evidence base on its impact, and breaking down institutional silos between memory practitioners and violence or atrocity prevention practitioners.

The roundtable made clear that the preventive and transformative potential of memory is real — and that at a time of rising polarization, historical revisionism, and identity-based violence in Europe, the field has both a responsibility and an opportunity to rethink its practices. The question is not only how memory can help prevent future violence, but also how unresolved pasts can limit European societies’ capacity to build democratic and inclusive institutions and to respond to future crises, such as ecological crises. The gathering was a space not only for honest reckoning with the limits of current approaches, but also for surfacing innovative practices emerging from communities around the world, the new alliances forming across memory work, transitional justice, atrocity prevention,

and social justice movements, and the growing number of institutions ready to engage with new memorialization methodologies that seek to enable transformation processes.

KEY INSIGHTS FROM THE ROUNDTABLE DISCUSSIONS

From Institutional Bias to Inclusive Memory Governance

Participants discussed a foundational challenge to the European memory frameworks. The systems that determine what is remembered, whose experiences are centered, and which events are treated as foundational are not neutral instruments of historical preservation. They reflect choices made within particular historical and political contexts, by particular institutions and actors, shaped by the assumptions and power relations of their time. Those choices have produced significant gaps in official commemorative culture: the histories of colonialism, migration, women's experiences, Roma communities, anti-war traditions, and others, have remained largely at the margins of European remembrance. According to participants, this has also relegated the wars in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia

and Kosovo to the margins: European discourse has at times treated Russia's invasion of Ukraine as the first major war and large-scale suffering in Europe since the Second World War, allowing the 1990s wars to appear as a separate, "regional" history rather than as part of Europe's own recent past.

These gaps reflect the priorities of frameworks built at a specific historical moment, by actors who held a particular — and necessarily partial — understanding of what European identity meant and what it required.

Participants observed that these frameworks are grounded in a narrative that portrays Europe as being fundamentally defined by human rights, tolerance, and democratic values — a narrative that has served important purposes in building postwar solidarity, but that sits in tension with the continent's own history of colonization, enslavement, violence and systematic discrimination against some identity-based groups inside Europe. Sustaining that self-image has required leaving significant parts of European history underexamined. The consequences extend beyond the historical record: unexamined colonial legacies, unresolved violence, impunity, denial, ethno-nationalist narratives, and hierarchies of victims contribute to present-day inequalities, inform attitudes toward racialized migrants, and continue to shape the consistency — or inconsistency — of European responses to humanitarian crises and mass atrocities, as well as institutions, public discourse, ideas of citizenship



and belonging, and what is considered politically acceptable today.

Participants welcomed the pressure that survivors' groups, historians, civil society organizations, minority communities, and youth movements have placed on European institutions to broaden their memory frameworks in recent years. Its impact has, however, been limited, they noted. At the national and EU levels, policymakers have often incorporated previously marginalized histories while treating them as supplementary to those considered central, inadvertently creating hierarchies and competition for recognition and resources. The result is often fragmentation – which can harden into open conflict over competing historical claims, with real consequences for social cohesion, and at the cost of the solidarity that shared historical understanding is meant to produce.

At the level of museums, memory sites, and cultural institutions, participants acknowledged the growing efforts of practitioners to build more inclusive and complex narratives and to amplify overlooked or erased histories. A persistent tension remained, however: too often, they noted, these institutions still speak on behalf of marginalized communities rather than with them, reproducing the very exclusions they seek to address.

Building more inclusive public memory, participants concluded, requires more than incorporating previously marginalized perspectives into existing commemorative frameworks and narratives. It demands a deeper reckoning – reconsidering the assumptions, priorities, and institutional structures that shape what Europe chooses to remember, how it interprets its past, and whose experiences are centered in that process.

Genuine reform, they argued, begins with an honest acknowledgment of the colonial foundations of European identity and the systemic inequities and institutional biases that have historically shaped the dominant narrative and how memory is produced, funded, and governed.

This recognition must translate into concrete institutional assessment – a serious examination of how memory institutions have operated, which communities they have served, which they have excluded, and how exclusion has been reproduced, often unintentionally, through curatorial choices,

funding priorities, governance structures, and the assumptions embedded in professional practice.

What is ultimately required, participants argued, is the construction of genuinely inclusive institutions and processes aiming to enable transformative processes of memorialization – ones where affected communities participate as active agents in shaping memory policies and practices, rather than appearing merely as subjects of memory consulted after decisions have already been made. This means developing transparent co-creation processes that go beyond community consultation and provide real opportunities for communities to contribute. This includes the development of new methodologies, ensuring meaningful and informed participation, clarifying the transformative aim of memorialization processes, allocating sufficient time and resources for engagement, and building the sustained relationships and trust that genuine participation requires.

Implementing these approaches may require adapting institutional procedures, timelines, and decision-making processes. Institutions should therefore assess whether their existing governance arrangements, funding structures, and project planning allow for sustained collaboration with communities.

CONFRONTING INSTITUTIONAL SILENCES

Across the world, museums, historic sites and memory institutions are embarking on a difficult but necessary process – addressing long-standing silences, confronting exclusionary practices, and transforming themselves from within. Building on the practices and lessons learned from its global network, the International Coalition of Sites of Conscience (ICSC) supports institutions through every stage of this journey: from reflection on institutional exclusion and building awareness of structural barriers, to planning for repair and reciprocity, sharing power, and co-creating projects with the communities whose histories they engage. The *Correcting the Record* methodology² and the *Addressing the Silences* toolkit³ have been collaboratively shaped by ICSC members and community partners across the world to support the Sites of Conscience and like-minded organizations in engaging in institutional transformation and building more inclusive collective memory.

2 International Coalition of Sites of Conscience, *Correcting the Record: Building Inclusive, Equitable and Engaged Societies One Narrative at a Time* (2022). Available at: <https://www.sitesofconscience.org/2022/12/correcting-the-record-building-inclusive-equitable-and-engaged-societies-one-narrative-at-a-time/>

3 International Coalition of Sites of Conscience, *Addressing the Silences* (2025). Available at: https://www.sitesofconscience.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/10/ICSC-Addressing-the-Silences-toolkit_Sept30.pdf

For policymakers, donors and funders, these conclusions carry direct implications for how memory work is funded, governed, and evaluated. Funding criteria should move beyond project outputs to assess the quality and depth of community participation — rewarding institutions that demonstrate genuine power-sharing rather than tokenistic consultation. Governance requirements should encourage or mandate the inclusion of historically marginalized communities in decision-making bodies, advisory structures, and curatorial processes. Institutional standards should reflect the time, resources, and relational investment that meaningful co-creation demands — recognizing that participation cannot be reduced to a box-ticking exercise within existing timelines and procedures. European memory frameworks and funding instruments have an opportunity to drive this transformation by making inclusion, accountability, and structural reform conditions of support rather than optional enhancements.

From Passive Remembrance to Participatory and Transformative Memory

A central concern running through roundtable discussions was the gap between the intentions of memory work and its actual effects. Much of the field, participants observed, rests on an assumption that has rarely been rigorously tested: that emotional engagement with historical suffering will naturally translate into changed behavior: “If people feel enough — if they are moved by the right stories, confronted with the right images, brought into proximity with historical pain — they will act differently”.

Scientific evidence, participants argued, questions this assumption, as do behavioral sciences⁴. The rise of denialism and revisionism across Europe has occurred after decades of Holocaust education. The genocides in Srebrenica and Rwanda unfolded while “never again” commitments were firmly institutionalized. The ongoing genocide in Gaza and the fractures it has provoked in European societies are exposing, once again, the limits of a theory of change built on emotional engagement alone.

These are not failures of awareness. In the case of Srebrenica, Rwanda and Gaza, the facts were known, personal testimonies had been shared and the language of moral responsibility invoked. And yet the lessons did

not translate into policies of prevention, protection, non-recurrence and other timely action⁵.

One of the core problems, among others, discussions suggested, lies in how dominant approaches treat memory as something belonging to the past — to be preserved, commemorated, and transmitted with fidelity to the next generation. In this model, communities, and especially young people, are positioned as audiences rather than participants: recipients of a finished historical account rather than active agents in its interpretation. With this model memory practices become initiatives of passive commemoration. For young people in particular, historical memory feels distant, irrelevant, and disconnected from the realities that actually shape their lives. When memory does not speak to lived experience, it does not generate the critical reflection or sense of agency that learning requires — and without those, the opportunity to understand, and ultimately to transform, the present is lost.

This is not a failure of individual educators or institutions but of a model of memory work that speaks at communities rather than with them, that prioritizes the integrity of the historical record over the needs and agency of living people, and that mistakes emotional exposure for civic transformation.

Leveraging memory as a driver of change, participants argued, requires adopting a participatory and transformative approach to memory — one that understands remembrance not as the transmission of a finished historical account, but as an active civic practice through which people connect the past to their present realities and develop the capacity to act on what they find.

Rather than inviting people simply to receive an established narrative, participatory memory work invites people to critically examine its framing, identify whose perspectives are included or absent, connect it to their own experiences, and reflect on its relevance for the present. It asks: what does this history illuminate about the present? What patterns recur? What conditions enabled past violence, and where do those conditions exist today? This means, participants emphasized, building engagement around dialogue rather than transmission.

It also means, discussions made clear, meeting people where they are. Memory work that remains within institutional and cultural comfort zones — in established museums, formal curricula, and commemorative ceremonies — reaches those who are already

4 Paul Slovic, “If I look at the mass I will never act”: Psychic numbing and genocide,” *Judgment and Decision Making* (2007); Albert Bandura, “Moral Disengagement in the Perpetration of Inhumanities,” *Personality and Social Psychology Review* (1999)

5 Stanley Cohen, *States of Denial: Knowing about Atrocities and Suffering* (2001)



predisposed to engage. Effective memory work requires sustained engagement in schools in underserved areas, prisons, community centers, streets, and digital spaces, and with people who are skeptical or actively hostile to existing memory frameworks. Participation must become substantive rather than rhetorical. Genuine participation means allowing individuals and communities to actively shape how the past is remembered — including which aspects are foregrounded, which connections to the present are drawn, and what forms of action the remembrance is meant to inspire.

Participants also highlighted the importance of creative and accessible formats of engagement. Oral history, performance, digital storytelling, community art, and collaborative archiving are examples of engagement that make it possible to reach communities and audiences for whom conventional formats remain distant or exclusionary. A striking example came from the Hrant Dink Foundation (HDF) in Turkey: when authorities banned HDF from holding an academic conference on the multicultural history of the city of Kayseri, they responded by organizing a “dumpling festival” – *manti*, a famous regional dish – at HDF premises the following week. Nearly a thousand people gathered to cook, eat, and discuss history together, an act of joyful collective solidarity that bypassed censorship and reached a far wider community than the conference ever would have⁶.

Participatory memory work, participants concluded, represents a fundamental reorientation of memory work. Its purpose is not only to ensure the integrity of the historical record, but also to cultivate in present-day

societies the moral responsibility, critical awareness, and collective capacity to act differently when it matters.

PARTICIPATION IN ACTION

The War Childhood Museum documents childhood experiences of armed conflict through personal objects and first-person testimonies contributed by individuals who lived through war. Participation lies at the core of the Museum’s methodology. Contributors are not treated simply as sources of historical material but as active participants in shaping how their experiences are documented, interpreted, and shared.

Recognizing that transformative memory work cannot remain confined to museum spaces, the Museum has developed extensive outreach programs that bring these conversations directly into schools and communities across Bosnia and Herzegovina, including underserved areas with limited access to cultural institutions. The Museum uses workshops, traveling and pop-up exhibitions, peacebuilding initiatives, and collaborations with teachers, artists, and civil society organizations, to enable young people to become active participants in interpreting memory rather than passive recipients of historical narratives. These programs use storytelling, creative expression, dialogue, and collaborative learning to connect personal experiences of the past with present-day questions of human rights, social cohesion, and civic responsibility.

⁶ Hrant Dink Foundation, *Dumpling Festival was Held*. Available at: <https://hrantdink.org/en/site-of-memory/announcements/3839-dumpling-festival-was-held>

From Polarized or Consensual Memory to Dialogic Memory

Roundtable discussions identified two limiting approaches that memory practices often move between – and that both, in different ways, undermine memory’s transformative potential.

The first, participants observed, is identity-driven, polarized remembrance, in which memory becomes a tool for consolidating group identity – emphasizing collective suffering, heroism, and moral innocence while delegitimizing or erasing the experiences of others. Here memory ceases to be a reckoning with the past and becomes a weapon in present-day political conflict. The “us versus them” logic it reinforces does not heal divisions – it deepens them.

On the other hand, participants noted, some memory initiatives seek to support reconciliation by emphasizing a consensual understanding of the past. While motivated by a genuine desire to foster dialogue and social cohesion, these approaches risk reducing historical complexity, sidestepping unresolved tensions and questions of responsibility, and minimizing asymmetries of power. In these cases, reconciliation efforts may prioritize narratives of unity over engagement with contested histories and ongoing grievances.

Several participants described this dynamic as a form of “peace-washing” – the promotion of narratives of harmony and coexistence that does not sufficiently address the historical experiences and structural conditions that contributed to violence, and that risks generating resentment and transmitting unresolved trauma to future generations.

According to participants, this challenge is visible in parts of the Balkans, where many externally supported initiatives have focused on building interpersonal connections through activities such as youth exchanges, cultural programs, sports initiatives, and community projects. While such efforts can create meaningful opportunities for contact and cooperation across divided communities, participants noted that without sustained engagement with questions of historical interpretation, accountability, and recognition, they may have limited capacity to address deeper disagreements over the past.

Participants pointed to Spain’s trajectory as a further illustration of how consensual or reconciliation-oriented language can itself become a vehicle for monologic reassertion, rather than a basis for genuine dialogue. From the Transition to democracy onwards, the country’s approach to the Civil War and the Franco dictatorship was shaped by an implicit “Pact of Forgetting” (Pacto del Olvido), which prioritized political stability and reconciliation over confronting the crimes of the dictatorship, leaving many victims without redress, recognition, or knowledge of the fate of their disappeared relatives. Spain’s 2007 and 2022 memory laws sought to move beyond this silence, establishing state responsibility for supporting victims, exhuming mass graves, and removing symbols honoring the Franco regime. Participants observed, however, that this progress has since met a regional backlash that repurposes the very language of reconciliation: so-called “Concordia” (Concord) laws promoted in Aragón, Castilla y León and the Valencian Community invoke civil peace and reconciliation to reintroduce equidistance between victims and perpetrators, treating the violence of the dictatorship and the resistance against it as morally equivalent. For participants, the Spanish case illustrates that consensual memory frameworks are not static: the same vocabulary of reconciliation can be mobilized first to enforce silence, and later – once memory laws begin to challenge that silence – to reassert a one-sided narrative under a renewed appeal to unity and peace.

Polarized and consensual approaches, participants concluded, share a common flaw: both treat memory as a conclusion rather than a process, and neither creates the conditions for difficult histories to be genuinely worked through.

Rather than deepening divides or forcing premature reconciliation, participants proposed “dialogic memory”⁷ as an alternative framework – one that creates space for communities to engage honestly with difficult and contested histories – building shared understanding, rebuilding trust, and strengthening social cohesion while preserving the complexity of their histories.

Dialogic memory is best understood as an approach rather than a fixed model. It holds that different communities’ experiences and perspectives carry equal

7 The notion of “dialogic memory” draws on Bakhtinian dialogism and on emerging work in memory studies that understands remembering as a relational process through which multiple, including marginalized and conflicting, perspectives can be heard and engaged across difference. It is related to, but distinct from, the concept of “agonistic memory” developed by Bull and Hansen, which foregrounds the productive role of political contestation and disagreement. Here, dialogic memory is used more broadly as a normative and practice-oriented approach grounded in human rights principles, attentive to the effects of trauma and unequal power, and committed to honest engagement across difference. Its aim is not to eliminate disagreement or produce a single shared narrative, but to create conditions for listening, recognition, relationality, and the rebuilding of trust and social resilience. See Anna Cento Bull and Hans Lauge Hansen, “On Agonistic Memory,” *Memory Studies* 9, no. 4 (2016): 390–404; Ksenia Robbe, Andrei Zavadski, and Agnieszka Mrozik, “Dialogic Remembering as Method: Activating Relationality in Memories of Postsocialist ‘Transitions’,” *Memory Studies* 19, no. 3 (2026): 748–765.

value, even when they diverge or conflict. Grounded in human rights principles and forensic truth — the evidence-based establishment of facts about past events through investigation, documentation, and verification — it creates space for personal experience to be heard and recognized, for multiple perspectives to coexist, and for critical reflection and collective learning to emerge across differences, while still supporting an accurate historical record and accountability for human rights violations.

By creating emotionally safe spaces for encounter and honest engagement across differences, dialogic approaches strengthen inter-community trust, foster shared understanding, and build the social foundations that make communities more resilient and less vulnerable to manipulation and division.

This does not assume that dialogue is always readily achievable. In societies where communities currently seem irreconcilable, and where power, recognition, and safety remain asymmetric, meaningful dialogue may not yet be possible at all. In these contexts, dialogic memory is less something to be applied than an orientation to be worked toward over time — resting on preconditions such as a shared factual basis, recognition of victims and harm, safety, accountability, and gradually developed trust.

SHARED SPACE FOR DIALOGUE

In Northern Ireland, the Ulster Museum explicitly rejects the model of a consensual shared memory of the Troubles — which, as the museum itself acknowledges, does not exist. Instead, it positions itself as an enabler of thought and debate, a space where visitors are encouraged to consider diverse perspectives on culture, history, and society. The museum understands itself as a shared and trusted space that welcomes questions, discussions and challenges.⁸

Art and creativity play a central role in this approach, offering powerful means of surfacing different perspectives and providing an antidote to the rhetoric that accumulated over decades of civil and political conflict. One particularly compelling example was its CultureLab exhibition (2020). Inspired by a famous scene in the television series *Derry Girls*, the museum recreated a blackboard on which Catholic and Protestant children had been asked to list their differences — which filled the board — and their similarities — which remained empty. Displaying this prop in the museum powerfully, and humorously, highlighted the absurdity of sectarian stereotyping to the visitors. It has since become a permanent exhibit.



Dialogic memory recognizes the long-term and often intergenerational trauma that conflict inflicts on individuals, families, and communities at large. Unaddressed psychological wounds — carried by individuals and communities across generations — can calcify into resentment that resurfaces at moments of social tension, fueling new cycles of division and harm. Adopting a trauma-informed approach⁹ and fostering innovative methods for engaging multiple generations in sharing their experiences and perceptions of the past and present is crucial to rebuild trust, foster collective healing, and prevent violence.

Participants observed that what makes this possible, above all, is trust — built through patient, bottom-up engagement led by and with the communities most directly affected. Creative approaches such as art, theater, and role-playing were identified as particularly powerful tools in this process, offering alternative languages for collective healing and opening pathways for connection across divides.

⁸ National Museums Northern Ireland, *Troubles and Beyond* (2022). Available at: <https://cms.nationalmuseumsni.org/sites/default/files/2022-10/NMNI-Troubles-and-beyond-A5-LR.pdf>

⁹ The Trauma-Informed Approach (TIA) recognizes that traumatic experiences terrify, overwhelm and violate the individual. TIA is a commitment to not repeat these experiences and, in whatever way possible, restore a sense of safety, power and belonging.

Participants also noted that the most effective initiatives incorporate the perspectives of bystanders and perpetrators who accept responsibility, rather than solely centering victims. They argued that this is essential for rehumanizing those on all sides of a conflict and building the conditions for sustainable peace. A powerful example came from Colombia: a victimized community, offered the opportunity by a court to send their perpetrator to prison, refused. They argued that imprisonment would allow him to “continue dehumanizing” – to remain separate and abstract. Instead, they demanded he return to live among them, attend their school, and worship at their church. For this community, forcing him to exist alongside them was the only path to genuine humanization and lasting peace.

From Depoliticized Remembrance to Accountable Memory

European memory policies and practices have largely been developed around the consensual register of honoring victims, drawing universal moral lessons, and building narratives centered on shared humanity and tolerance. Participants recognized the real strengths of this approach — it has allowed countries that were once at war to build common ground around core values, and has sustained broad public support for remembrance over decades. Commemorations and education and awareness through museums, memory sites and schools around the Second World War are a good example.

However, participants argued this approach has limits as it often avoids examining difficult questions about the structures that make violence possible in the past and in the present. Accountability, in this sense, must extend beyond identifying individual perpetrators: without this broader lens, crimes can appear as isolated or “apolitical” events, rather than as violence connected to broader political projects, ideologies, institutions, and structures of power. People are invited to witness the recognition of suffering that mirrors their own, while the conditions producing that suffering go unaddressed and persist. If the aim of memory work is to learn from the past in order to prevent the recurrence of violence in the present, then learning about historical violence cannot be reduced to moral lessons about tolerance and shared humanity while avoiding questions of justice, accountability, and the structural causes of violence.

Memory work, participants insisted, is inseparable from broader struggles for anti-racism, decolonization, gender equality, and social justice. The fight to have the Romani genocide recognized in official European memory cannot be separated from the fight against anti-Roma discrimination today. The demand to account

for colonial violence is inseparable from movements for reparation and racial equity — as seen in the work of communities and organizations that draw direct lines between colonial histories and the contemporary experiences of racialized migrants, arguing that honest reckoning with the past is a necessary foundation for understanding and challenging the inequalities that continue to shape who is welcomed, who is protected, and who is not.

Yet many memory institutions and practitioners, participants observed, continue to avoid drawing these connections — to the underlying structures of violence, and to the communities organizing against those structures today. The justification most often put forward is the decision to remain apolitical: to avoid alienating certain audiences, contributing to polarization, or being co-opted by ideological agendas. But this so-called neutrality is not a neutral position. Whether intentional or not, it tends to uphold dominant narratives, obscure structural injustice, and leave memory institutions silent in the face of present-day injustices and atrocities.

Memory that avoids harder questions about structures and power does not prevent violence — it commemorates it, participants concluded. The preventive power of memory lies in its capacity to examine the political, economic, and social structures that enabled historical violence and that continue to operate, in different forms and contexts, in the present — asking not only who committed the crime, but what political and social conditions, institutions, and power relations made it possible, and what allowed it, or its consequences, to remain unaddressed. This is what “accountable memory” means.

Accountable memory, participants were careful to clarify, does not mean abandoning rigor or becoming an instrument of advocacy. It means ensuring that accountability remains a core component of memory and reconciliation efforts, rather than allowing political considerations or donor priorities to limit discussions of responsibility for past crimes. It means building structural independence as a precondition for effective memory work, and diversifying funding to protect genuine freedom of expression.

Accountable memory also means creating space for genuine dialogue across differences — including on the most contested and politically charged subjects, participants emphasized. Civil society-led initiatives engaging with Palestine demonstrate that honest, respectful conversation is possible when grounded in human rights principles, international law, and a recognition of different experiences and structural causes rather than identity-based opposition.



CONNECTING STRUGGLES, BUILDING SOLIDARITY

European Jews for Palestine is a European network of 24 affiliated Jewish groups across 14 EU Member States that connects the memory of the Holocaust and the experience of antisemitism with the struggle for Palestinian rights and opposition to the ongoing genocide in Gaza. The network challenges the idea that memory should serve only as a marker of collective identity or remain confined to the experiences of a single community. Instead, it enables communities to draw connections across different histories of persecution, exclusion, and violence – while actively resisting the instrumentalization of historical suffering to justify new harm.

The network illustrates how accountable memory can reach beyond particular histories and identity-based frameworks to build solidarity, forge cross-community alliances, and drive collective action in the service of justice and violence prevention.

Finally, participants argued for an “intersectional and coalitional approach”. Memory’s transformative potential is significantly amplified when pursued in alliance with movements for social justice. This requires

building genuine solidarity across victims, survivors, and affected communities – recognizing how race, gender, class, disability, and other axes of power have shaped both historical violence and its memory – and actively bridging memory work with anti-racism, gender equality, LGBTQ+, disability rights, ecological and peace movements. Young people, participants noted, are already leading this cross-movement work and must be treated as essential allies.

From Silos to Integrated Prevention Frameworks

The pledge of “never again” is central to memory work; the commitment to transform the remembrance of extreme violence into the prevention of, the protection against and the non-recurrence of extreme violence. Participants affirmed that this preventive potential is real and multidimensional. Memory combats denialism, revisionism and impunity – as well as subtler, harder-to-name forms of distortion (relativization, minimization, the equating of victims and perpetrators) and the silence that often surrounds them – factors that often legitimize future violence. It helps societies understand how discrimination, dehumanization, and hate narratives escalate into atrocity-prone dynamics. It enables citizens, educators, policymakers and community leaders to

recognize early warning signs and reject narratives that normalize violence. It provides recognition to victims and creates space for personal and collective healing preventing trauma and grievances from hardening across generations. It fosters inclusive histories and identities, and rebuilds trust between divided communities. It generates evidence-based elements that can shape reforms in policy, education, and governance to address structural inequalities, cultural and ideological violence that increase atrocity risk.

Yet memory is rarely treated as a strategic component of long-term prevention, participants observed, and its preventive potential is consistently underutilized. It tends to be relegated to transitional justice frameworks – where it plays an essential role in post-conflict reckoning, accountability, and healing. Thus, memory work remains largely confined to post-violence contexts, understood as a tool for dealing with the past rather than part of conflict transformation and a global, holistic human security and protection issue. In settings that are not immediately post-conflict, it is sidelined in prevention agendas because it is perceived as cultural, educational, or commemorative rather than security-relevant, and as a result receives less attention, less funding, and is often absent from violence and conflict prevention and security and protection frameworks. The field also struggles, participants acknowledged, to demonstrate a credible, systematic connection between memory work and actual reductions in future violence. This is compounded by institutional fragmentation: memory practitioners, transitional justice, and atrocity prevention actors operate in largely separate worlds with little sustained dialogue.

Operationalizing the pledge of “never again,” participants argued, requires deliberately activating memory as a long-term prevention tool – integrating memory and transitional justice into national violence prevention strategies, foreign policy frameworks, and development programming not as cultural add-ons, but as core components of violence prevention architecture.

This begins, participants suggested, with memory institutions and practitioners reframing their work explicitly as a prevention, protection and non-recurrence tool – articulating clearly how memory initiatives contribute to early warning by building community resilience, identifying and challenging the narratives that precede violence, and strengthening the social fabric that makes atrocity less likely. This reframing requires greater intentionality about prevention in practice: developing concrete strategies for responding to the structural and cultural dimension of violence, much before direct violence erupts, and not only after harm has occurred. This means that, in post-conflict as well as non-post-

conflict settings, memory institutions should actively monitor the resurgence of denialism and revisionism, the dehumanizing narratives, the normalization of hate speech, the scapegoating of minority communities, and the erosion of democratic norms that history has repeatedly shown to precede mass violence, and develop memory-based civic education and community resilience programs in response, directly addressing the dynamics driving tension.

It requires sustained advocacy toward policymakers, participants argued, to stop treating atrocities as isolated events and start understanding them as a long-term process – with deep roots and a long aftermath – that demands preventive investment long before violence erupts. Concretely, this means making the case for memory and transitional justice to be integrated into national violence prevention strategies, foreign policy frameworks, and development programming as core components of violence and conflict prevention architecture. It means advocating for the inclusion of memory work as a formal criterion in processes such as EU accession, where the absence of transitional justice requirements has allowed unresolved histories of violence to go unaddressed, missing a critical window to embed accountability and reconciliation into the accession process itself. Accession can carry an unintended cost of its own: in some countries, it creates the impression that democratization and reckoning with the past are already complete, weakening the leverage that conditionality provides just when it is most needed. Participants emphasized the need to strengthen the evidence base on the impact of memory initiatives on violence and atrocity prevention by developing clearer approaches for evaluating their effects on public understanding, attitudes, and prevention-related goals. This requires moving beyond isolated examples and individual accounts toward more systematic forms of documentation and assessment.

Participants also stressed that affected communities should play an active role in defining what success looks like and in evaluating whether memory initiatives respond to their needs and experiences. This means involving communities not only as participants in memory projects, but also as partners in designing, monitoring, and assessing prevention-oriented approaches.

Finally, it requires breaking down institutional silos – establishing joint working groups and shared platforms that bring memory practitioners, transitional justice specialists, and atrocity prevention experts into regular, structured dialogue; developing common analytical frameworks for understanding how historical memory intersects with conflict risk; and building funding mechanisms that incentivize cross-sectoral collaboration rather than rewarding each field for working in isolation.

RECOMMENDATIONS

For Memory and Peacebuilding Institutions and Practitioners

CRITICALLY ASSESS HISTORICAL LEGACY AND COMMIT TO INSTITUTIONAL TRANSFORMATION

- Conduct deep institutional self-assessments that examine whose histories are centered, whose are absent, and what assumptions are embedded in approaches, practices, and narratives.
- Build inclusive structures and practices at all levels with decision-making power, not just consultative roles: diversify staff and leadership, and ensure representatives of historically marginalized communities shape governance decisions, strategies and programming.
- Develop partnerships with affected communities to co-design programs, methodologies, and educational materials and bring this work beyond institutional walls into youth centers, community settings, digital spaces and beyond, using creative, accessible and culturally diverse forms of engagement.
- Invest in youth-led initiatives with real resources, autonomy and ownership rather than incorporating young people as token participants in adult-designed programs.
- Plan for sustained cooperation beyond individual projects or events, including longer-term spaces for continued exchange among practitioners, academics, justice movements, communities, and policymakers.

FOSTER CRITICAL THINKING, PRESENT-DAY RELEVANCE, AND DIALOGUE

- Apply critical pedagogy and redesign memory education: move from transmission to inquiry, encourage questioning of dominant narratives, and help audiences identify gaps, silences, and the structural conditions that enable violence — past and present.
- Draw explicit connections between historical events and present-day realities making memory directly relevant to the lived experience of communities.
- Develop structured dialogue programs — with skilled facilitation and clear ethical frameworks — that bring people from different experiences and perspectives into sustained, meaningful engagement with shared and conflicting histories.

- Integrate a trauma-informed approach into all interventions recognizing that trauma can be not only individual but collective — carried by communities across generations.

CENTER ACCOUNTABILITY AND BUILD ALLIANCES ACROSS JUSTICE MOVEMENTS

- Integrate explicit analysis of historical roots of contemporary injustices into programming, using comparative approaches that connect different histories across the globe to help audiences recognize shared patterns and structural conditions rather than treating each history as isolated.
- Build active coalitions with anti-racism, gender equality, LGBTQ+ rights, disability rights, environmental justice, and peace movements, developing joint programming and advocacy initiatives that connect memory work to living struggles for justice.
- Develop clear internal policies and procedures to guide when and how institutions engage with contemporary injustices — particularly on issues that fracture societies — and establish strategies that prepare staff and leadership to anticipate backlash and defend institutional positions with principled, transparent frameworks.

OPERATIONALIZE PREVENTION

- Map and assess the specific pathways through which memory contributes to prevention and build methodologies and frameworks to assess impact, engaging affected communities directly in defining what impact looks like and in assessing whether it has been achieved.
- Map and integrate early-warning indicators of democratic backsliding into prevention frameworks, systematically tracking indicators such as the erosion of judicial independence and press freedom, the rehabilitation of authoritarian or genocidal figures and symbols, the rewriting or suppression of historical narratives, the scapegoating of minorities, and the normalization of exclusionary or dehumanizing language in public discourse.
- Develop clear internal prevention strategies that define how institutions and practitioners will respond when early warning signs of violence are present.
- Engage policymakers beyond the cultural and educational sector — reaching peacebuilding, security and prevention actors — to make the case for integrating memory work into conflict prevention

frameworks, early warning systems, and long-term protection and security strategies.

- Strengthen collaboration with conflict prevention actors and early warning networks to develop shared frameworks, exchange knowledge, and coordinate strategies that leverage memory as a tool for violence and atrocity prevention.
- Build a holistic approach to violence prevention, protection and non-recurrence by investing in cross-sectoral coalitions that bring together memory, cultural heritage institutions, conflict transformation, peacebuilding and prevention practitioners, engaged in exchanging knowledge, developing shared analytical frameworks, and coordinating strategies that leverage memory as an active tool for violence and atrocity prevention.
- Protect structural independence.
- Actively diversify funding sources to reduce dependence on any single donor whose conditions may compromise freedom of expression and whose economic models are inconsistent with organizations' ethical values and principles.
- Develop internal policies that protect staff and partners from institutional pressure toward self-censorship or depoliticization.
- Build solidarity networks among peer organizations facing censorship, political repression, or politically

motivated defunding, and develop collective strategies for creative resistance, advocacy, and strategic litigation.

For Donors and Funders

RESTRUCTURE FUNDING TO SUPPORT INCLUSIVE, INTEGRATED, LONG-TERM WORK

- Shift from project-based to institutional and programmatic funding that supports sustained, multi-year memory processes rather than short-term memory projects or contact-based activities.
- Set explicit targets for funding community-led, grassroots, and youth-driven initiatives, particularly those working with Roma, Sinti, Yenish and other identity-based communities who have experienced structural and cultural discrimination, exclusion and direct violence, and those working on migration histories, colonial legacies, and other historically underfunded areas.
- Fund sustained processes to develop shared evaluation methodologies across the memory field that can demonstrate connections between memory work and prevention outcomes.
- Establish cross-sector funding mechanisms for integrated memory, prevention, peace and security to support integrated frameworks that include memory as a core component.



PROTECT GRANTEE INDEPENDENCE

- Remove funding conditions that push grantees toward apolitical neutrality, consensual narratives, or avoidance of politically sensitive subjects.
- Actively support grantees working on contested histories and contemporary issues — including colonial legacy, racism, migration, environmental destruction, and ongoing conflicts — rather than limiting funding to historically safer terrain.
- Establish emergency funding mechanisms to support organizations facing censorship, political repression, or politically motivated defunding because of their memory work.

For European Union Institutions and Member State Governments

BUILD INCLUSIVE MEMORY GOVERNANCE

- Commission independent reviews of EU and national memory funding to assess which histories receive institutional support, remain underfunded or excluded, and what structural changes are needed to address these imbalances.
- Establish participatory mechanisms enabling historically excluded or underrepresented groups to contribute meaningfully to the design, implementation, and evaluation of funding

schemes, education programs, commemorative practices, and heritage policies at both national and European levels.

- Support and institutionalize structured cross-sector collaboration among memory practitioners, historians, educators, civil society actors and affected communities working on diverse historical experiences by creating sustained platforms, joint funding mechanisms, and recurring exchange formats that enable equitable partnerships, shared methodologies, and co-produced analyses and interpretations of history, as well as coordinated strategies to address its contemporary legacies.

INTEGRATE MEMORY INTO PREVENTION ARCHITECTURE

- Include memory work and transitional justice as formal criteria in the EU accession process.
- Integrate memory practitioners and their expertise into EU early warning systems, conflict prevention mechanisms, and atrocity risk assessment frameworks, including the EU Action Plan on Human Rights and Democracy, the EU Framework for Atrocity Prevention, and the work of the EU Conflict Early Warning System (EWS).
- Establish dedicated funding within EU peace and security instruments for memory-based prevention work, recognizing it as a long-term protection, peace and security investment.

ANNEXES

AGENDA

Monday, March 23

Arrival

Tuesday, March 24

Location: Europe House, Sarajevo, Maršala Tita 62

8:30–9:00

Registration and Welcome Coffee

9:00–9:30

Opening Session

WELCOME REMARKS:

- **Luigi Soreca**, European Union Ambassador to BiH
- **Amina Krvavac**, Director for Bosnia and Herzegovina, War Childhood Museum Foundation
- **Kristian Herbolzheimer**, Director, International Catalan Institute for Peace

OBJECTIVES AND OVERVIEW OF THE DAY

- **Silvia Fernández**, International Coalition of Sites of Conscience

9:30–10:00

Keynotes Framing

The keynotes will explore the role of memory as a form of reparative justice and as a tool for cohesion, resilience and prevention. They will invite participants to critically examine the limitations of current memory policies and practices, critically reflecting on where they have fallen short. The presentations will prompt participants to consider why memory work risks fueling competing narratives and polarization, and why emotional connections to past suffering have not consistently translated into meaningful action to prevent discrimination and violence. The keynotes aim to inspire participants to rethink their work, envision new strategies, and foster new connections.

KEYNOTE SPEAKERS:

- **Hasan Hasanović**, Survivor of the Srebrenica genocide, Author, Head of Oral History Program, Srebrenica Memorial Center (BiH)
- **Mô Bleeker**, Special Adviser of the United Nations Secretary-General on the Responsibility to Protect (Switzerland)

FACILITATOR:

Ajnura Akbas, Research Coordinator, War Childhood Museum Foundation (BiH)

10:00–10:50

Roundtable Discussion I – Mapping Gaps and Limitations

This session will provide a focused examination of the current shortcomings in memory policies and practices. Key gaps to be discussed include the risk of reinforcing dominant narratives, sidelining marginalized histories, and contributing to competing narratives and social polarization; the reliance on identity-based approaches that lead to fragmentation and compartmentalized histories; and the weak connections between memory work and contemporary efforts to address discrimination and prevent violence. The session aims to create a shared understanding of where memory policies and practices fall short, setting the stage for subsequent sessions that will explore new ideas and approaches.

SPEAKERS:

- **Zilka Spahić-Šiljak**, Academic Director of Feminism and Religion (FER) School, Transcultural Psychosocial Educational Foundation (TPO) and University of Sarajevo (BiH)
- **Emmanuel Achiri**, Policy Advisor at ENAR - European Network Against Racism (Regional-Europe)
- **Marije Hristova**, Ramón y Cajal Researcher, Department of Anthropology, Institute of Language, Literature and Anthropology (ILLA), Spanish National Research Council (CSIC) (Spain)
- **Shada Islam**, Managing Director, New Horizons Project Geopolitical Strategy Advice and Analysis (Belgium)

MODERATOR:

Refik Hodžić, Strategic Communications and Transitional Justice Specialist (BiH)

10:50–11:40

Small Group Discussion I

In small groups, participants will be encouraged to reflect on how their own work or frameworks may unintentionally reproduce the gaps identified during Roundtable I. They will share experiences and examine shortcomings in policies, practices and frameworks, fostering a shared awareness that can guide more inclusive and effective approaches in subsequent sessions.

11:40–12:30

Plenary

12:30–14:00

Lunch & Informal Networking

14:00–14:50

Roundtable Discussion II – Building Inclusive and Cross-community Memory Policies and Practices

This session will explore how memory policies and practices can become more inclusive, ensuring that marginalized histories are recognized and integrated without contributing to fragmentation or polarization. Participants will examine strategies for designing memory initiatives that go beyond single-identity narratives.

SPEAKERS:

- **William Blair**, Director of Collections, National Museums Northern Ireland (Northern Ireland)
- **Nikola Kandić**, Head of Local Branch Office-Sarajevo, Regional Youth Cooperation Office - RYCO (BiH)
- **Nayat Karaköse**, Director of Programs, Hrant Dink Foundation (Turkey)
- **Sanela Bešić**, Director, Kali Sara – Roma Information Center (BiH)

MODERATOR:

Maria Fanlo, Peace Advisor at the Civil Peace Service (CPS), the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) - Ethiopia (Spain)

14:50–15:40

Small Group Discussion II

Participants will reflect on strategies for making memory policies and practices more inclusive and intersectional. In small groups, they will discuss ways to recognize marginalized histories, and address overlapping experiences of oppression. Groups will identify practical approaches and key insights to share in plenary, informing collaborative solutions and next steps.

15:40–16:30

Plenary

17:00–18:00

Visit to the War Childhood Museum

19:00–20:30

Group Dinner

— — — — —

Wednesday, March 25

Location: Europe House Sarajevo, Maršala Tita 62

9:30–9:45

Welcome

9:45–10:00

KEYNOTE SPEAKER:

- **Alma Mustafić**, Survivor of the Srebrenica genocide, Lecturer and Researcher, Access to Justice, Utrecht University of Applied Sciences (the Netherlands)

FACILITATOR:

Justine Di Mayo, Senior Program Manager, International Coalition of Sites of Conscience (ICSC)

10:00–10:50

Roundtable Discussion III – Memory as a Tool for Prevention: Linking Memory to Action

This session will explore how historical memory can move beyond awareness and education to become a practical tool for prevention. While memory work fosters understanding and empathy, ritualized or symbolic approaches often fail to inspire meaningful action to address ongoing discrimination and prevent violence. Participants will discuss strategies for translating memory into civic engagement and embedding it in concrete anti-discrimination and prevention mechanisms. Participants will also explore how memory initiatives can be strategically linked to policies and actions that prevent discrimination and polarization.

SPEAKERS:

- **Branka Vierda**, Independent Researcher and Educator (Croatia)
- **Yoav Shemer-Kunz**, Political Scientist, Affiliated Faculty - Syracuse University and Co-founder of European Jews for Palestine (France)
- **Edina Bećirević**, Associate Professor, Faculty of Criminal Justice, Criminology, and Security Studies, University of Sarajevo (BiH)
- **Jaclyn Streitfeld-Hall**, Deputy Executive Director, Global Centre for the Responsibility to Protect (US)

MODERATOR:

Amra Hadžimuhamedović, Director, Centre for Cultural Heritage of the International Forum Bosnia (BiH)

10:50–11:40

Small Group Discussion III

Participants will reflect on strategies for translating historical memory into practical prevention efforts. In small groups, they will discuss ways to connect memory initiatives to anti-discrimination and prevention actions and identify key insights to share in plenary for collaborative solutions.

11:40–12:30

Plenary

12:30–14:00

Lunch & Informal Networking

14:00–15:30

Working Groups - Toward Practical Strategies and Policy Roadmap

- **Working Group 1: Transforming Memory Policies and Practices for Inclusion and Intersectionality**

Participants will work together to identify concrete policy actions that could make memory initiatives more inclusive and intersectional. The group will work to propose actionable models or pilot ideas to embed participatory and cross-community approaches into memory initiatives to promote dialogue, collaboration, and collective responsibility.

MODERATOR:

Kristian Herbolzheimer, Director, International Catalan Institute for Peace - ICIP (Spain)

- **Working Group 2: Designing Practical Tools to Link Memory with Prevention**

Participants will work to identify concrete ways memory initiatives can feed into early-warning systems, anti-discrimination policies, and civic engagement strategies. The group will propose actionable mechanisms that connect memory to prevention and will consider ways to measure the impact of memory initiatives on public attitudes, civic behavior, and intercommunity dialogue.

MODERATOR:

Teresa Vazquez, Senior Director of Operations, International Coalition of Sites of Conscience (ICSC)

- **Working Group 3: Establishing Collaborative Spaces for Rethinking Memory**

Participants will focus on identifying concrete steps to establish collaborative spaces where civil society actors working on memory, peacebuilding and violence prevention and policymakers can jointly design and pilot new approaches to memory.

MODERATOR:

Lejla Gačanica, Human Rights Officer for Transitional Justice, UN OHCHR (BiH)

15:30–16:30

Plenary and Next Steps

16:30–17:00

Closing Session

Closing remarks

17:00–19:00

Visit to Memory Sites in Sarajevo (Optional)

ANNEXES

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Adisa Džino	Cultural Heritage Without Borders-BiH (BiH)	Bosnia and Herzegovina
Aida Vežić	Balkan Museum Network	Bosnia and Herzegovina
Ajnura Akbas	War Childhood Museum	Bosnia and Herzegovina
Alma Mustafić	Utrecht University of Applied Sciences	The Netherlands
Amina Krvavac	War Childhood Museum	Bosnia and Herzegovina
Amra Hadžimuhamedović	Center for Cultural Heritage, International Forum Bosnia	Bosnia and Herzegovina
Aneta Vladimirov	Serb National Council	Croatia
Branka Vierda	Transitional Justice Specialist	Croatia
Catherine Gilbert	Newcastle University	UK
Chema Sarri	International Catalan Institute for Peace (ICIP)	Spain
Claudia Jossi	swisspeace	Switzerland
Dearbhaile O'Callaghan	European Peace Liaison Office	Belgium
Edina Bećirević	Genocide scholar at the University of Sarajevo	Bosnia and Herzegovina
Elena Monicelli	Monte Sole Peace School	Italy
Emmanuel Achiri	European Network Against Racism - ENAR	Belgium
Hasan Hasanović	Srebrenica-Potočari Memorial Center and Cemetery	Bosnia and Herzegovina
Iñigo Retolaza Eguren	Gernika Gogoratuz	Spain
Jaclyn Streitfeld-Hall	Global Centre for the Responsibility to Protect	US
Justine Di Mayo	International Coalition of Sites of Conscience	France
Khrystyna Soltysiak	International Renaissance Foundation	Ukraine
Kristian Herbolzheimer	International Catalan Institute for Peace (ICIP)	Spain
Lejla Gačanica	UN OHCHR	Bosnia and Herzegovina
Luigi Soreca	EU Ambassador to Bosnia and Herzegovina	Bosnia and Herzegovina
Maida Salkanović	War Childhood Museum	Bosnia and Herzegovina
Maria Eugenia Blandón	International Catalan Institute for Peace (ICIP)	Spain
Maria Fanlo	GIZ	Ethiopia/Spain
Marija Čečen	Fund B92	Serbia
Marije Hristova	Institute of Language, Literature and Anthropology (ILLA-CSIC)	Spain
Mô Bleeker	UN Special Adviser on the Responsibility to Protect	Switzerland
Nayat Karaköse	Hrant Dink Foundation	Turkey
Nikola Kandić	Regional Youth Cooperation Office - RYCO	Bosnia and Herzegovina
Refik Hodžić	Strategic Communications and Transitional Justice Specialist	Bosnia and Herzegovina
Sanela Bešić	Kali Sara	Bosnia and Herzegovina
Shada Islam	Commentator on EU affairs	Belgium
Silvia Fernández	International Coalition of Sites of Conscience - ICSC	Spain
Teresa Vazquez	International Coalition of Sites of Conscience - ICSC	US
Velma Šarić	Post-Conflict Research Center	Bosnia and Herzegovina
Vesna Bajšanski-Agić	Strategic Alliances and Global Development at TechSoup	Bosnia and Herzegovina
William Blair	Ulster Museum / National Museums Northern Ireland	UK
Yoav Shemer-Kunz	European Jews for Palestine	France
Zilka Spahić-Šiljak	TPO Foundation and University of Sarajevo	Bosnia and Herzegovina
Zlatan Hajlovac	ProPeace	Bosnia and Herzegovina

SUPPORTED BY:

