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ABOUT HUMANITY IN ACTION

Humanity in Action is an international organization that educates, inspires and connects a network of university students and young professionals committed to promoting human rights, diversity and active citizenship in their own communities and around the world. Humanity in Action is a non-profit, non-partisan organization with governing and advisory boards in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Denmark, France, Germany, the Netherlands, Poland and the United States. Humanity in Action’s international headquarters is in New York City.

Humanity in Action has educated over 1,500 young leaders who now form a unique international community. The annual Humanity in Action Fellowship brings together more than 150 European and American university students and young professionals each summer in programs in Denmark, France, Germany, the Netherlands, Poland, the United States and Bosnia and Herzegovina to discuss, learn and research in international groups. Humanity in Action Fellows meet leading experts and activists to study historical and contemporary cases of institutional violations of human and minority rights.

Humanity in Action supports all Fellows financially for the duration of their programs, allowing for the merit-based selection of diverse applicants. Humanity in Action also provides professional development opportunities. It maintains an international network of students, young professionals, established leaders, experts and partners for which it organizes a range of educational and career opportunities, including seminars, workshops, study trips and fellowship positions at leading civic and political institutions, such as the European Parliament and the United States Congress. These opportunities encourage emerging leaders to develop their professional abilities and introduce established leaders to the ideas of the younger generation.

Humanity in Action’s network of leaders is a valuable resource to policy-makers, diplomats, educators, business leaders and civic-minded individuals and organizations. By the end of the decade, Humanity in Action will connect over 2,500 professionals working in all sectors, on a range of critical issues, in countries around the world.
The inaugural Humanity in Action Fellowship in Sarajevo took place during a time of extraordinary challenges in post-conflict democratic transition of Bosnia and Herzegovina. The program delved deep into the topics of transitional justice and post-conflict ethnic-based identity politics. It added up diversity to the educational experiences and broadened the HIA program scope beyond Western Europe and the US. Humanity in Action Bosnia and Herzegovina hosted 14 fellows, from 7 different countries (4 Bosnians, 4 Americans, 3 French, 1 German, 1 Dutch and 1 Danish), and three interns, from the US, Canada and Serbia. Most of them were staying with local host families. Although the bulk of the program took place in Sarajevo, HIA BiH organized several educational day-trips to Mostar, Stolac, Konjic, and Srebrenica.

Inspiring leaders from diverse sectors, from both government and non-government organizations, foreign and local policy think-tanks, business, media, and academy, gave lectures and presentations, bringing multiple perspectives to bear on outlined human rights issues. We hosted nearly 50 speakers, including high level guests like HE Ambassador Valentin Inzko, High Representative of the International Community in BiH, Mrs. Jasminka Dzumhur, Ombudsperson for human rights of BiH, Mr. Jakob Finci, President of the Jewish Community in BiH, Dr. Svetlana Broz, human rights activist and grand-daughter of ex-Yugoslav President Josip Broz Tito, and many others. The program was kicked off by a lecture of Professor Lamija Tanović, Chair of BoD Humanity in Action BiH, who spoke on a number of the challenges she has observed in the Bosnian education system. The program ended with American and European Fellows’ Presentations; The US fellows talked about the voter suppression in areas with high African-American populations, push against the narrative in Islam against women, understanding the term ‘Latino’ in the US, personal experiences of racism, etc. The European Fellows split their presentation into three overarching themes: minorities, nationalism and the refugee crisis. The program concluded with a trip to Athens for the 7th Annual HIA International Conference.

The Humanity in Action BiH Fellowship was designed as a platform for discussing these important issues. Specifically, the program in Sarajevo focused on questions related to human rights, diversity, pluralism, contemporary dynamics, and discourses currently pervading in local multicultural settings within BiH society. Our program, dense and intense from an intellectual and personal perspective, aimed to build trust and a sense of community among the participants foreign and domestic so that they make every effort to remain connected to and active in the HIA network. HIA’s ‘on site-based’ learning model allowed fellows to perceive connections among issues, people, and places in unanticipated ways.

We are extremely grateful for the opportunity provided by our supporters, especially the School of Economics and Business (University of Sarajevo) and the Open Society Fund of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Humanity in Action Inc., Humanity in Action Germany, and other private donors. Humanity in Action Bosnia and Herzegovina looks forward to the next year’s program, enlarging its senior fellow network, as well as creating more exchange among emerging leaders in all countries where HIA is operating and beyond.
Humanity in Action held its 7th Annual International Conference “Europe at Crossroads: Perspectives from Athens” under the auspices of the City of Athens in June 2016.

The conference hosted 37 diverse speakers, 9 carefully chosen thematic city walks and 4 site visits. The presence of 250 Humanity in Action conference participants immensely contributed to the visibility of the organization in specific realms of civil society in the Greek capital. Through the conference, the organization also enlarged its Greek network and intensified contacts to academics and NGO leaders. Many of the speakers were impressed with the appeal of the organization and the level of discussion as well as inquiry.

The 2016 International Conference investigated a range of critical issues concerning Greece’s political and economic situations. Greece is currently at the forefront of multiple intersecting crises – foremost the migration crisis, as Greece is the first destination for hundreds of thousands of migrants and refugees, as well as a hub for human trafficking. Greece is also in the midst of a financial crisis as the country's institutions and civil society continue to fracture under the pressure of the recession in Europe and the country’s ties to the European Union.

The conference included keynotes, discussions and workshops with leading Greek and international experts. It also featured the annual Senior Fellow Reunion Dinner, skills training sessions, networking opportunities and tours within Athens.
ERNEST BRITT Duke University

Ernest is a recent graduate of Duke University where he earned degrees in political science and English with a minor in Spanish studies. He was involved with Duke’s Black Student Alliance and gained experience on campaigns in Florida (his home state), Charleston, S.C., and Washington, D.C. Ernest is passionate about social justice and politics. His research on voter disenfranchisement and work producing a documentary on voting rights taught him the power of narrative in addressing these issues. He helped organize Duke Law School’s first civil rights conference and promoted student civic engagement. Ernest began working at a political media firm in D.C. this summer, and in the future he hopes to continue exploring the intersection of new media & politics or attend law school to specialize in civil rights/election law.

BERINA VERLAŠEVIĆ American University of BiH

Berina is a third year student at the American University of BiH - Department of Graphic and Multimedia Design. A volunteer for many years, she gained experience writing and working on projects in collaboration with the NGO Youth Power in Mostar. Her expectations of the fellowship were to learn more facts about BiH while listening and discussing with people from different fields in order to gain different perspectives, something she felt was achieved through the fellowship. She appreciated how the fellowship provided an overview of the main issues and problems that are currently being faced in BiH, while also providing her with contacts that can assist her in answering any specific questions about a topic discussed during the fellowship.
LOKE BISBJERG NIELSEN
University of Copenhagen

Loke is currently completing a masters in African Studies, and is writing his thesis on the Boko Haram insurgency in Nigeria. His interests currently lie somewhere within the field of theoretical approaches to irregular warfare and ethics. Loke expected the fellowship would be a pleasant time with like-minded people from different countries trying to grasp the intricacies of history, conflict, post-conflict, justice, international society, ethics, interventions, diversity, democracy, activism and many other things. He also expected to get to know some really nice people, share stories, both personal and academic, learn about himself through learning about others, go out with people and experience Bosnia together, meet Bosnians and learn about living, life, culture, music, religion and so on in the region from the people living there. Loke’s favourite memory from the fellowship was hiking the mountains around Sarajevo with Nicolas Moll, a lecturer at the program, telling the fellows about the siege while visiting important places of its history, enjoying a coffee on the mountainside while talking to the other fellows and sharing each other’s knowledge.

TASNEEM MANER Villanova University

Tasneem is a Presidential Scholar who studied Biology and Humanities at Villanova University. As a student activist, she facilitated diversity and inclusion programs around Black Lives Matter movements, protests against violence, and religious minority awareness events. She cofounded the Interfaith Coalition, organized an interfaith service trip, and reinitiated her school’s Muslim Student Association. This fall, she will begin a doctorate in optometry, and plans to focus on underserved communities. She appreciated the addition of Sarajevo to the fellowship programs organized by HIA, as it adds a diversity to the educational experience, while expanding the program beyond Western Europe and the United States.
Allie is a graduate of Colgate University with a major in Peace and Conflict Studies and a focus in premedicine. Upon graduation, Allie taught food and garden-based science classes with Native youth as a FoodCorps Service Member in her hometown of Portland, Oregon. She was also a Fulbright Student Scholar to Ghana where she researched the hair salon as a space for women’s health education. What Allie appreciated most about the Sarajevo Fellowship was that it encouraged looking outside of her assumptions and perspectives through discussions and the intense, immersive schedule during the fellowship.

Harun recently completed a bachelor’s degree program at the Faculty of Law at the University of Sarajevo, where he is engaged as a student assistant at the Department of Civil Law. In addition to his university education, he is active in the NGO sector and was a member of the OSCE Youth Advisory Group. He is also president of the European Law Student’s Association Sarajevo. His expectations of the HIA Fellowship were to learn more about human rights challenges that occur in the countries of the other fellows. Harun’s favourite part of the fellowship was the fact that fellows were given the time to shape themselves, and he considered it one of the most amazing extracurricular activities that he participated in during his university education.
Armin studied Creative Writing and Journalism at the University of Hildesheim. He works as a freelance journalist and writer. He is currently finishing his Master's Degree at Leibniz University Hanover, being enrolled in an interdisciplinary course with an emphasis on globalization, postcolonialism and migration. Armin expected to gain deep insights into the national history of Bosnia and its current human rights situation while also building strong bonds and friendships during this fellowship. Armin liked the openness of the domestic participants, and that they freely talked to the other fellows about sensitive scars of their personal and their nation’s past.

Laura is a third-year student at Sciences Po Lyon. She spent a year abroad at the University of Berkeley, California, where she studied Sociology and Human Rights. Laura expected the fellowship to give her a more precise overview of the political, social and economic situation of the country. After one month in Sarajevo, she found that the program offered fellows a great deal of knowledge about peace building challenges in Bosnia and Herzegovina, while also allowing them to meet a community of active people bounded by a similar interest in social justice and human rights. One of favorite moments of the Sarajevo Fellowship was the various group conversations that took place both in and out of class with the other members of the HIA group, which she found were intellectually and emotionally stimulating in ways that she had not anticipated. She believes this is the reason why her experience as a HIA fellow was so rewarding and intense.
Ljupko is a journalist and media maker from Banja Luka, Bosnia and Herzegovina. He is interested in investigative and data journalism, and reporting both for and in the interest of youth. He is a student at the College of Communications, and continues to work as a freelance journalist in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Ljupko expected to learn about new means to effectively address human rights violations in BiH, especially those that are more systemic, while also receiving opinions on how his generation can and should deal with issues that have been inherited from the past without conflict arising. He puts great value on the openness of the group that allowed for sincere, sensitive and emotional discussions without labels while respecting each other’s values.

Zaynab is a student in International Studies at Leiden University in the Netherlands. She is interested in conflict studies and mediation. She spent a semester abroad studying in Baku, Azerbaijan. Her expectations for the fellowship in Sarajevo were to learn about the history of BiH, as well as daily life in the county and the role of youth activists in society. She is grateful for the attitude of the group towards the difficult topics covered, especially in discussion outside of sessions that added a crucial human aspect that made the experience truly valuable. She was inspired by the program to continue to work on human right issues, even if they become difficult at times.
Georgia graduated with a major in English (Creative Writing) and double-minoring in French and Comparative Literature from the University of Southern California. She has conducted literature research since her freshman year, being awarded a USC SURF grant, the Provost’s Fellowship, and the Mellon Mays Undergraduate Fellowship. She appreciated and was impressed by the caliber of speakers who spoke during the fellowship, including Valentin Inzko, the high representative of the International Community in BiH, and Almir Alić from the ICTY, as well as the wide variety of topics covered about the Bosnian war and the post-conflict issues. She particularly liked the study visits outside of Sarajevo, as they enriched the cultural immersion and allowed for a better exposure to many of the post-conflict issues being experienced in BiH including the historicization of genocide and current ethnic divides.

GEORGIA SOARES University of Southern California

Tiffany has just completed a four-year Anthropology degree at University College London (UCL). She spent her third year at Sciences Po Paris. Specializing in forced migration, systemic discrimination, and minority rights, she carried out primary research for her thesis on the political agency of non-status refugees in Paris, who were protesting against homeland and host land violence. She appreciated that the fellowship was a unique opportunity to not only engage in a short, intensive educational programme that allowed to connect with other young activists, but that it also maintains an action-oriented goal of implementing an Action Project. She also appreciated speaking to individuals from the public and private sectors, the media, the international community and the Bosnian diaspora to better understand the issues being experienced in Bosnia, while also being able to visit sites and memorials that were discussed in lectures.

TIFFANY SHAKESPEARE University College London
Elma is a fourth year student of the Faculty of Law at the University of Sarajevo. She is currently working at the American Councils for International Education BiH as a Program and Administrative Assistant. In her free time, she volunteers for Youth for Peace (working with orphanages) and the Center for Media Law. Elma appreciated that the Fellowship pushed her to look at everything in Bosnia from a different perspective, while also allowing her to learn about how people see, experience, and feel her city. For Elma, the Fellowship wasn’t only about lectures, but also about emotions and friendships.

Julie is currently finishing a Masters in International Public Management at Sciences Po. Focused since high-school on African-Americans and what is at stake with minorities in France, she enlarged her scope to include minorities and women, multiculturalism, discrimination and racism. She appreciated visits to the cities of Stolac and Mostar, as they are divided cities, as well as the visit to Srebrenica, which allowed the fellows to see the physical reality of what occurred where it occurred as opposed to just discussing it, an experience she felt was extremely intense.
The program was divided into the following subsections:

- Overview of Current Socio-Political and Democratic Challenges in BiH
- Religion in a Multi-Confessional State
- A House Divided: Cities Under Tension and Segregation
- A New Generation, A New Dialogue
- The Flight of Money, Brain, and Talent
- The Interplay of Identity and Civil society
- Cultural Resilience: Surviving Post-Dayton BiH
- Lights, Camera, Action! The Politics of Media
- Positioning and Agency: Women in BiH
- Linking Mobilization to the Current Refugee Crisis
- In, Out and Around the System: Mobilizing Change
- LGBTQ Rights and Delegation Presentations
- Contextualizing Historical Narratives of Bosnia and Herzegovina
- Art and Culture: A Refuge and Source of Strength in the War
- Yugo-Nostalgia
- Under Siege: Sarajevo in the Midst of War
- The Horrors of War: Consequences of Mass-Violence on Marginalized Groups
- Never Again: Remembering Srebrenica

THE FELLOWSHIP IN NUMBERS

14 FELLOWS

7 COUNTRIES

57 SPEAKERS

4 STUDY TRIPS

15 LOCAL SITE VISITS

8.6/10 PROGRAM GRADE

8.32/10 AVERAGE LECTURE GRADE

9.25/10 STAFF GRADE

Fellows and Staff with His Excellency Dr. Valentin Inzko, High Representative for Bosnia and Herzegovina
For many years, Prof. Tanović has been intensively engaged in activities for reform and improvement of the education in Bosnia-Herzegovina. From 2001-2004, she was head of the Department for International Scientific, Technical, Educational and Cultural Cooperation at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Bosnia-Herzegovina. Prof. Tanović talked about a number of the challenges she has observed in the Bosnian education system, and provided the fellows an overview of the complicated history of the region. She described the system of “two schools under one roof”, providing examples from across Bosnia including the Gymnasium in Mostar, which now hosts a Bosniak school, a Croat school and the UWC campus in Mostar. Prof. Tanović also expressed her personal discontent with the way in which the Bosnian constitution was included in the Dayton Peace accords. Questions from the fellows ranged on topics from ethnicity as part of the Bosnian identity, to the role of the international community in Bosnia, which Prof. Tanović noted has diminished significantly in the past eight years.

Midhat Izmirlija provided an overview of the constitutional and legal realities that exist in BiH. After showing a brief video introducing Bosnia and Herzegovina, Dr. Izmirlija spoke about the two identities that each person in BiH has: the identity of being a Bosnian, as well as a member of one of the “constituent peoples”. This makes BiH a plural society, in which one person does not have one vote. Democracy is only possible in this instance should each group be represented according to Dr. Izmirlija, and this can be achieved through the creating of a functional formula. He also pointed out that the political parties in BiH do not follow the traditional left-right spectrum, but are predominately ethnic-based.
Kurt Bassuener, a Co-founder and Senior Associate of the Democratization Policy Council, has worked with the Office of the High Representative in Sarajevo, the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe’s Election Observation Mission in Ukraine, the International Rescue Committee, the U.S. Institute. Mr. Bassuener joined the group via Skype from Belgrade. Speaking specifically to post-Dayton BiH, Mr. Bassuener highlighted that BiH is a very loose state association. This entire system was designed around the interests of the signing parties of the Dayton Agreement. Mr. Bassuener argued that BiH has become an oligarchical structure. After a period of high returns from 2000-2005, there was a number of events that shaped BiH presently in the following year. First, the High Representative announced that they would be stepping back in their oversight of the BiH government, which has allowed political elites to figure out they could get away with more. This was also the year that constitutional reform failed in BiH as a result of not receiving the required 2/3 majority to pass. Presently, many Bosnians are cynical, but not apathetical about their political system. He concluded that many people vote against their long-term interest in order to preserve short-term interests.

Ms. Ivana Korajlić provided an analysis of the role that Transparency International has had in increasing government accountability in BiH, which includes providing legal aid and advice for people looking into institutions or civil servants. She defined BiH as a “captured state”, one arrested by the interests of ruling elites and one essentially serving those in power. She noted that the current system in BiH discourages people from coming forward to report corruption, however there has been an increase in reports of corruption from those trying to change the system. Ms. Korajlić argued that the current ethnic divisions are an obstacle, as local politicians make an issue identified about ethnicity as opposed to corruption. Ms. Korajlić also emphasized that the successes of TI in the political financing realm have been easier to achieve when working within a single institution rather than in the system as a whole. Citizens have also started reporting corruption, and “agents of change” within institutions who are more willing to cooperate are being found.
Dr. Kapidžić spoke to the fellows about democratic representation in multi-ethnic states, using specific examples of the case of BiH. For Dr. Kapidžić, democratic representation is when the only thing that matters is that the person elected as of the same ethnic group as you. While he identified political parties as being part of the issue of the political system in a multi-ethnic society, they are needed and one cannot work around them. To define ethnic groups, Dr. Kapidžić used the constructivist definition in that it is a subset of categories in which descent-based attributes are necessary for membership, with both nominal and activated categories. Using this definition, an overlap can be found in BiH. He also identified the shift from ethnic mobilization to ethnic parties as a distinct phenomenon. In his opinion, BiH’s system has also institutionalized ethnicity, with different positions in the government being assigned to people of certain ethnic groups, and thus the state institutions are adopting categories that someone has to fit into. In Dr. Kapidžić’s view, political parties in BiH are also extremely centrifugal, in that they only care about their own policies.

Prof. Mujkić spoke to the fellows about the role of “ethnopoltics” in the former Yugoslav republics. He argued that the current system in BiH is designed to generate crisis and can be termed an “ethnocracy” based on institutionalization of ethnic difference and on territorialized ethnicity. He argued that in areas with higher minority populations with a higher level of conflict, which was the case in Yugoslavian republics where the political and ethnic borders did not match and thus there was a higher mixture of peoples. Prof. Mujkić also talked about the precursor to the 2014 protests, the issue of children born after February 2013 having no ID number and thus not being able to register and receive benefits. For him, this is an example of how far elites in BiH are willing to go in order to preserve their narrow interests. The protests themselves were also important as it was the first time that something was done on a non-ethnic basis, showing that this is possible in BiH.
Prof. Čehajić-Clancy spoke to a number of research projects she has completed on the construction of social identities. One of these was conducted in East Sarajevo, where people related to their Serb identity though supporting the tennis player Novak Djokovic. She also talked about intergroup contacts, and that the effects of said contact is not necessarily straightforward. The reason why this contact has not been successful has been that people tend to get caught in what their group is doing, which leads to a lack of empathy for the perceived “other” and the assumption that all those in the “other” group are the same. In her address, professor mentioned dehumanizing process that continues to this day, saying that this makes it easier to kill and is about self-interest above all else. She argued that, if equal status between groups existed, there would be no conflict between groups. If youth are given more opportunity for affirmation, they can blossom as individuals and improve their self and intergroup relations. However, in their view, this is not currently present in public education.

Prof. Abazović’s talk focused primarily on general aspects of secularism in a society. The concept of secularism grew in the 1960s as a result of many factors. Prof. Abazović spoke to the rational choice of religion, specifically the “religious economies” model. He presented a number of models for religion on society, specifically a securable but extremely religious society where religious leaders have no effect on politics, to a theocratic model where the state leaders are the religious leaders. He also spoke to varying degrees of secularism, specifically hard vs. soft secularism, or French laïcité vs. Ataturk secularism. In these societies, religious and non-religious people have a common space to work together and where religious people do not look down on those who are not religious. For Prof. Abazović, there must be a distinction between religious rights and religious feelings, as only rights can be protected by the state. The fellows asked a number of questions, including what different strategies are for addressing secularism, which Prof. Abazović believed were dependent on actions of both the state and the organized religion in that state.
Mr. Brkan’s organization has been active in BiH since the early 2000s. According to Mr. Brkan there are currently 12,000 registered NGOs in BiH, and only 10% of NGOs in the country are currently active, with less than half of those actually doing anything. He argued that achieving the mission of civil society in BiH is difficult given that the system is built around constituencies. NGOs in BiH are more efficient now, and per Mr. Brkan are at a level where they can perform well. In terms of the current state of affairs, the possibility of compromise in the political system has never been as small as it is now. Mr. Brkan also described the active role he and his organization had during the protests in 2013 and February of 2014. The 2013 protests, which resulted from newborns in BiH not being given IDs and led to a number of problems. Mr. Brkan believed that after the government agreed to do what they had been protesting against that the organization should have left, however others felt it was necessary to stay. In the 2014 protests, he criticised the protest movement as being a strategic catastrophe that was not inclusive.

The presentation on Sevdah music was given by Maja Baralić-Materne, an ethno-musicologist. Ms. Baralić-Materne spoke about the history and significance of Sevdah music, a traditional style of music throughout the Balkans that she compared to the blues. The songs—love ballads that evoke sorrow and describe what is dear to the heart—have been popular in the region for hundreds of years; they were passed down through oral tradition before recording devices could record the melodies. Sevdah has changed throughout history, at times reflecting a more conservative role of women in society when women weren’t allowed to play wind instruments, and in modern times incorporating new artists like Bozo Vreco, Divanhana and Damir Imamović who have risen to popularity in recent years. She concluded that she has the most beautiful job, as like a doctor deals with the body, she deals with the soul.
Behind the Scenes at SARTR (Sarajevo War Theater)

Nihad Kreševljaković
Executive Director, MESS Festival

Mr. Nihad Kreševljaković of the Sarajevo War Theater spoke to the fellows about his involvement in the project during the war, as well as some of the present day realities that exist as a result of the war in BiH. Mr. Kreševljaković started working with the War Theater in 1993. The theater was founded with special importance for the protection of the city of Sarajevo. He spoke of the two film festivals that occurred during the siege of Sarajevo, where people went not to be seen but to watch, meaning there was an audience for this during the siege. Another important cultural event he spoke of was the Susan Sontag directed production of Waiting for Godot during the siege, which he called the most amazing thing he had ever seen. Mr. Kreševljaković stressed the importance of self-humour, so long as this is used about oneself and not others. He also believed it is important to discuss openly what happened during the war, including stressing that the Bosniak population in BiH should be careful as to how they deal with the genocide that occurred against them in order to not become the perpetrators in the future.

Two Schools Under One Roof: Personal Insight from a Youth Student Activist

Samir Beharić
HIA Fellow and Student Activist

Samir Beharić spoke to the fellows about the “Two Schools Under One Roof” policy that exists at school in the federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina. In total, there are 54 schools that use the “two schools under one roof” policy in three of the cantons in the Federation. This program began in 1997. At that point, he was separated from Croat students with whom he had had class with before. Under this system, members of minority groups were allowed to pick which “school” they attended, while Bosniak and Croat students were not given this choice. This triggered a nationalist gene in some students, while other backlashed against the policy, especially if they had friends of different ethnicities. For Mr. Beharić, the policy has become another way to put people in boxes. Mr. Beharić conducted a workshop with the fellows, who were divided into three groups to get the perspective of the others. The first were politicians, who were asked to answer why the policy was necessary and how to make it better; the second were students who were asked to determine any positive or negative aspects of the policy and the third were history teachers, who were asked how they would teach three different narratives (Bosniak, Serb, Croat) in a unified school.
Ms. Ivana Kešić talked about the work done by CIVITAS with youth in BiH. After presenting the work that has been accomplished by CIVITAS, including the development of interpersonal skills to create dialogue among youth in BiH as well as a dialogue for social change which is necessary to advocate for these changes, Ms. Kešić divided the group into two groups in order to either advocate for or against the use of school uniforms in presentations that would be made to the Ministry of Education, school directors, parents and students. After a discussion among the groups, the teams were told to switch which side they were representing, with only one member of the original group being allowed to work with the new group to assist in presenting the arguments for or against school uniforms.
Damir Šaljić of the British Embassy in Bosnia and Herzegovina spoke to the fellows about some of the current structural economic issues that are being faced in post-conflict BiH. Mr. Šaljić argued that the institutional reality must be kept in mind when addressing the economy in BiH, as entities deal with most economic affairs and very little is done at the federal level. Statistically, BiH has a 45% actual unemployment rate and a youth unemployment rate of 61%, the latter being one of the highest in the world. This is a result of a non-active labour force, as many who participated during the war would rather take a payment between 250 and 400 € from the government than find employment. Mr. Šaljić stated that in order to rebalance the economy, it is necessary to have growth in the private sector, investments and exports. Another issue Mr. Šaljić identified was the lack of a proper transportation strategy in BiH, which both the EU and Germany have said is necessary.

Ms. Emina Ganić gave a talk about the intersection of culture and human rights in the context of BiH. She gave the context of the Bosnian war being the first fully televised war in history, with the first targets having been the maternity ward of the hospital and the library, making it evident that it was also a cultural war. Ms. Ganić believed that culture is strong during periods of war as a result of humanism, in that it allows man to be a creator. She spoke of the example of graffiti found near Srebrenica that was incredibly demeaning towards Bosnian women, which has since been used in art in order for people to “get angry”. Ms. Ganić also talked of the first Sarajevo Film Festival that took place during the Siege in 1995. This was seen as an act of defiance, but has led to a generation of fantastic artists. However, she argued that there has been a sense of apathy in younger generations when it comes to culture, as no prominent artists have been born after 1984. Ms. Ganić believes that art has to progress, and that a level on intellectual engagement allows people to distinguish between “trash” and “not-trash”. Fellows also asked if the intersection of art and human rights can go too far, which Ms. Ganić believed was true, especially if an artist makes it too obvious that the project is about human rights, which is easier to do in film than in visual art.
According to a World Economic Forum database, BiH has one of the highest emigration rates in the world. In 2015, 80,000 young people left the country. Mr. Amer Osmić spoke to the fellows about a study completed regarding the “brain drain” currently occurring with Bosnians leaving the country. The study was completed with 1,004 respondents between 15 and 27 years old, with a third of the respondents coming from Republika Srpska and the other two-thirds coming from the Federation. The study identified a number of primarily economic motives for young people to leave the country, including easier employment, better education and a higher chance of running your own business abroad. Almost 50% of the young people in the study expressed a desire to leave the country, while just under 38% had no migration aspirations. The most preferred destination of those migrating was Germany, with 41% of respondents putting this as their preferred destination. As a result of what Mr. Osmić saw as a lack of investment in youth, the four cities with the highest brain drain rate in the country are also the four largest cities in the country: Tuzla, Banja Luka, Sarajevo and Mostar. Mr. Osmić’s talk ended with a passionate discussion with fellows on the attitudes of youth towards the current situation in BiH.

Dr. Hariz Halilović talked about the identities of Bosnian diaspora around the world. Dr. Halilović saw diaspora as being part of de-territorialized transnational communities, with displacement and de-territorialization leading to new employment opportunities and a re-territorialization. These communities also contain patterns and an interplay of memory and identity, using examples of a high number of Bosnian diaspora in the St. Louis area, where they have constructed a replica of the Sebilj. Dr. Halilović defined diaspora through four aspects; the cause of the original migration, relations with the homeland, relations with the host state and the forms of social organization. He mentioned that there are several predominant members of the Bosnian diaspora in their host countries, including the Minister of Education in Sweden and Members of the European Parliament. Questions from the fellows included whether future generations will be likely to remain in the diaspora or if they will integrate into their host societies more, which Dr. Halilović believed depends on a number of factors, but that people in diasporas around the world, not necessarily just Bosnians, will preserve their culture.
Dr. Svetlana Broz spoke to the fellows about her work during the war as a cardiologist, which lead to her compilation of stories and testimonies of courage during the war. After receiving her training in cardiology in Belgrade and came to northern Bosnia during the conflict. During this time, Dr. Broz saw that is was very rare to hear of people from one ethnicity to help those of another ethnicity. She compiled over 100 testimonies during the war, which she then transcribed. However, these were stolen from her house in Belgrade in an incident she believed was clearly politically motivated. She was able to get new testimonies, which she published as “Good People in an Evil Times” in 1999. Each of these testimonies was vetted by speaking to people who know the person who gave the testimony. There are also still many people in BiH who have untold testimonies from during the war. Dr. Broz believes the current environment in BiH is one where politicians play to the politics of fear, while also using the example of how the national parliament does not want to accept a proposal for a monument in front of parliament as they are not ready to face people who are “better than them” on a daily basis. She also spoke to the example of Serbia, where there are still many people who deny what happened during the war and are thus trying to recreate history.
Mr. Almir Alić talked about the role of the ICTY in prosecuting those who committed crimes during the wars in former Yugoslavia, as well as the next steps as the tribunal hands over responsibility to domestic courts. He provided a background of the wars that took place in former Yugoslavia between 1991 and 1999, while stressing that young citizens in BiH still feel the effects of the war every day and are living the consequences of this war. The court has given a voice to the many victims of the conflicts in the former Yugoslavia, including the 140,000 killed and millions of displaced people. More than 500 witnesses have testified at the tribunal, with over 85% of them not having any form of protection of identity. Of the 161 persons accused before the ICTY, including senior political and military leaders, 20 have plead guilty while 80 have been convicted, with a sentences totalling over 1100 years of imprisonment, as well as five life sentences. The court is helping to fight denial of crimes committed during the wars in the former Yugoslavia. Mr. Alić concluded that individualization of guilt that is done at the ICTY helps to prevent any collective guilt of crimes committed.

Dr. Nicolas Moll spoke to the fellows on attitudes within BiH, and Sarajevo in particular, regarding crimes committed by one’s own ethnic group. Mr. Moll argued that it is very difficult to remember when your own group commits a crime, and that there are different levels of recognition of these crimes within a society. He spoke to the example of the golden plaques and memorials that exist throughout the city of Sarajevo for deceased soldiers from the Federation. On the other hand, he analyzed the use of “criminals” on the old City Hall building when describing what occurred there during the war, and whether or not this could be considered demonizing. Dr. Moll spoke to specific examples of crimes committed by the Bosnian army against Serbs within Sieged Sarajevo, including crimes committed at the Kazani pit in 1993.
One of the main perpetrators of these crimes, Mušan “Caco” Topalović, was presented as a hero on the Bosnian side until October of 1993, however there is still no presentation of the fact that he committed crimes against Serbs and he was given an official burial as a “hero of the city”. There are different attitudes and confusion on this within the city of Sarajevo. Only one politician has visited the Kazani pit, and it was not discussed openly until 2014. There were other crimes committed elsewhere against Serbs, however there is no official commission and thus it is impossible to determine how many of these crimes occurred during the war in BiH. For Mr. Moll. Attitudes towards “own crimes” include silence, recognition, relativizing, minimizing and denial, each of which are found today in Sarajevo. He also stressed the role of a number of groups, including media, civil society actors, artists, international actors and historians in coming to terms with own crimes. In terms of the role of foreigners, he believed this is important as they have distance from the crimes that occurred.

Mr. Jakob Finci gave an analysis of the Sejdić and Finci v. BiH judgment by the European Court of Human Rights that ruled that the provision that only Bosniaks, Serbs and Croats can run for the Presidency of BiH is against the European Convention on Human Rights. Originally, Mr. Finci and Dervo Sejdić of the Roma community in BiH brought separate cases to the ECHR, but these were made into one case by the court. The ECHR took three years to render a verdict in favour of Sejdić and Finci, which is considered quite a short time frame for the court. While this was rendered in December of 2009, the verdict still has not been implemented. Bosnia and Herzegovina has been a member of the Council of Europe since 2002, and one of the conditions for membership was to align the constitution of BiH with the European Convention on Human Rights, however this was not enforced until last year as a result of the Sejdić and Finci judgment. Mr. Finci argued that the European Commission seems to think that it is impossible to come to a solution as other issues including unemployment and structural issues need to be dealt with. However, ascension to the European Union would only be possible if the verdict in the Sejdić/Finci case is implemented. Mr. Finci argued that implementation would only require changing one sentence in the constitution, and that there have been positive reactions from political parties regarding the issue. Fellows asked whether anti-Semitism is a problem in BiH and whether Mr. Finci finds the term “others” to be offensive. Mr. Finci denied that anti-Semitism is an issue in BiH, stating that Jews have lived in BiH for 450 years and are very incorporated into the society, while in terms of the use of the term “others”, he believed this is much nicer than other names they could be called.
Refusing to Surrender: Football as a Means of Resistance in Besieged Sarajevo

Predrag Pašić
Football Coach, Sarajevo

Mr. Predrag Pašić is a former international football player who played for domestic clubs and the national team of Yugoslavia. He is most remembered for his work during the Siege of Sarajevo, when he founded a multi-ethnic football school where he taught a philosophy of unity and teamwork through sport. The “Ladybug” school, which Mr. Pašić considers his greatest achievement, was established through a call on a radio station, inviting children to join on 15th of May 1993. Over 300 boys came out to the Skenderija stadium, avoiding sniper fire. The school included children of different nationalities and religions. For Mr. Pašić, sport is a place with no boundaries or differences. He saw the school as a way to try to see normal when your life was in danger every moment of the day. He spoke of unfortunate events that took place at football stadiums across former Yugoslavia and how these were used to promote political agendas. The school also later provided computer courses, English lessons, as well as a swimming school with trips to the seaside. Three alumni from the school participated in international football games for Bosnia and Herzegovina. Today, the school has unfortunately been closed for over a year due to financial reasons.

Collective Memory of Mass Atrocities in BiH

Hikmet Karčić
Senior Associate
Institute for Islamic Tradition of Bosniaks

Mr. Hikmet Karčić talked about the role of collective memory within BiH. Different collective memories exist in each of the three ethnic groups. He argued that there are two predominant images the collective memory of the war in Bosnia; the Siege of Sarajevo and Srebrenica. Practices of memory include the use of collective funerals with the exhumation of mass graves, as well as the establishment of memorials such as the approx. 15 different memorials in Prijedor. There are also, however, examples of “counter-commemorations” for military victims, included commemorations in Bratunac on 12 July.

Questions from the fellows included what young people should do to remember, with Mr. Karčić recommending audio-visual tools and learning from witness reports and court evidence. Fellows also asked if collective memory has been politicized, which Mr. Karčić saw some truth to in cases such as Srebrenica, where Bosniak politicians only go to be seen, but do not visit smaller communities. As well, crimes committed in central Bosnia are only commemorated by Croats.
His Excellency, Ambassador Dr. Valentin Inzko, High Representative of the International Community for Bosnia and Herzegovina, spoke to the fellows about his role in BiH. He provided a historical overview of the country. He explained the status of the OHR in the constitutional system of BiH, including the Bonn Powers of the High Representative, which allow them to introduce or suspend laws and remove politicians. In the history of the High Representative position, these powers have been used 800 times, with 180 politicians being removed including three members of the Presidency. His Excellency emphasized that many institutions that were created from scratch following the establishment of the Office of the High Representative. The biggest achievement of the Office of the High representative for His Excellency was the creation of one army for the entire country, which took a total of 10 years. His Excellency also emphasized the stability of the Bosnian Mark, which he believes is the most stable currency in Europe. Speaking to the current talks of BiH ascending to the EU the letter of application for membership was submitted on 15 February, showing a clear direction of BiH towards Brussels and a Euro-Atlantic agenda.

Prof. Goran Marković talked about some of the legal and constitutional aspects of human rights in BiH. He stated that there are many dilemmas and doubts about the human rights system in BiH. There are currently two systems of human rights protection at the entity level. Article 2 of the Constitution of BiH deals with the protection of human rights, which Prof. Marković believes shows how important this protection is, given the placement of human rights before state organization aspects of the constitution. Prof. Marković argued there exists a problem in the judicial branch within BiH. In BiH, all human rights international acts have to be respected as part of the constitution, especially the European Convention on Human Rights, which is given priority “over all other laws”. Annex I to the Constitution contains a list of the 15 international legal acts for the protection of human rights, however it does not give an explanation as to how these need to be applied to the protection of human rights in BiH. Prof. Marković presented two interpretations of these documents; one being that their placement in Annex I makes them “constitutional human rights”, the other being a more “pragmatic” opinion that these are not the constitutional human rights of BiH.
Ms. Jasminka Džumhur spoke to the fellows about her role as one of three ombudspersons for human rights in BiH. She was critical of the current implementation of international standards of human rights, as civil servants do not have the capacity to implement international standards for human rights and law curricula do not have these standards mainstreamed which results in students not learning these standards. More than half of the complaints received by the ombudsperson are related to the judiciary and administration in BiH. Citizens make complaints to the ombudsperson as a result of the non-execution of constitutional court and ECHR decisions, as well as the length of judicial procedures in BiH. Most cases handled by the ombudsperson are about political and civil rights, and more than 25% of these cases are solved by intervention from the ombudsperson. In terms of complaints related to human rights violations, the biggest categories of complaints are related to the judiciary, labour, pensions and administration. Ms. Džumhur also talked about the special reports made by the ombudsmen, which call attention to the manipulation or abuse of a vulnerable group, as well as addressing non-implementation of or compliance with international obligations. Ms. Džumhur also mentioned the effect the movie “Grbavica” had on increasing women’s rights in BiH.

Ms. Aiša Telalović of the Ministry of Human Rights and Refugees (MHRR) of BiH gave a talk about the current situation for a number of groups both in BiH and in the diaspora. Ms. Telalović described the work of the MHRR, including projects such as the establishment and running of the Agency for Gender Equality in BiH, reconstruction projects, policy creation on diaspora and coordinating and harmonizing policies and plans between BiH administration and the international community as it relates to housing policy, reconstruction and development and sustainable return projects for refugees. Ms. Telalović voiced that the strategic objective of BiH is to join the EU. In reviewing some of the aspects of the Dayton constitution in BiH, she pointed out that BiH was identified as an independent country in 1992, and that Dayton spoke to the country continuing “it’s legal existence”. She argued that the constitution itself has not been disseminated properly in BiH and that this has resulted in a lack of understanding in what is contained in the constitution, even though Annex 6 Article 15 states that it must be disseminated throughout the country. She argued that citizens need to engage actively in public consultations on legislative solutions, including knowing and using international mechanisms for the protection of rights and fundamental freedoms.
Prof. Jasna Duraković, a Member of Parliament for the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina, and Sabina Ćudić, a member of the Cantonal Assembly for Canton Sarajevo talked about the position of women in local politics. Dr. Jasna Duraković, Ph.D is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Communications at the Faculty of Political Science of the University of Sarajevo. She also serves as a Member of the House of Representatives of the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina, a position she has held since 2014. Sabina Ćudić is a lecturer in Political Science and International Relations at the Sarajevo School of Science and Technology (SSST) and a Member of the Cantonal Assembly for the Canton of Sarajevo. She serves as vice-president of the political party “Naša stranka”.

For Ms. Ćudić, signs that the role of women is weak in BiH include that there are no women in the Presidency, as well as the absence of a quota system. For her, the main issue is a lack of democratic representation within political parties, as governing bodies of political parties are made up of less than 20% women. She also argued that there is a militant patriarchy in terms of what citizens perceive a politician is, predominately as a male from the same ethnic group as them. She believes women need to be empowered not to be passive observers in politics and within political parties. Ms. Ćudić believes that the care system is particularly detrimental for the children and the elderly. In BiH, the perception is that care of these two groups falls to women. If high quality care existed for these groups, women could entertain the idea of joining public life. She also pointed out that BiH has the lowest participation rate in the workforce for women at 35%. Ms. Ćudić also discussed why her political party does not have a women’s forum, as she believed these divisions cause equal harm to men as they do to women.

Prof. Duraković agreed with Ms. Ćudić that political parties, even the liberal ones, are not democratic, and that there is not enough democracy in general in BiH. She stated the causes of the current discriminations against women in politics result from the fact that BiH remains a conservative patriarchal society. She argued that progress had been made over the previous two years, as there is higher and better representation of women elected in the country, including a 6% increase in women elected in 2014. She maintained that the economic and social empowerment of women will happen with contributions from NGOs, civil society, as well as the media, whom she believed need to allow women to speak in an affirmative way. A major problem Prof. Duraković identified was the lack of strict sanctions for not respecting quotas. Prof. Duraković further argued that Iceland should be the model for for gender parity, and that women need to stop being jealous of each other and work together.
Dr. Danijela Majstorović spoke to the fellows about an article she authored about the post-2014 political and economic restructuring in BiH. For Dr. Majstorović, the main problem in BiH is that the war isn’t over, as there still exists a war rhetoric and logic in many things creating a negative peace. She identified three phases of the politico-economic restructuring in BiH. The first period, between 1996 and 2006, was mainly a period where “carrot and stick” incentives were used for restructuring. The period between 2006 and 2014 was marked with a weaker level of international influence and an increase in ethno-nationalism. Post-2014, the main focus has been on the Compact for Growth document, which proposed six measures that were criticized from all sides as austerity and for being written in a “know-it-all” tone. The Compact was also criticized for removing implementation of the Sejdić/Finci verdict from its priorities. Dr. Majstorović argued that the protests that occurred in BiH in 2014 lead to a shared sense of identity, with people being equally at a loss with the capitalist system in place in what she termed a “plundered country”. She called the show of solidarity in Republika Srpska with the protests in the Federation unprecedented.

Ms. Armela Ramić talked about the judicial obstacles currently being faced by women victims of the war in attaining justice. She mentioned several challenges, such as the inclusion of victims in the criminal process, and the tendency to minimize sentences due to the young age of the perpetrators. She believes victims need to be provided with essential information and need to be protected; however the current system as there are no main protections for those who testify. Until 2015, it was also necessary for prosecutors to prove the element of force in cases of rape, which was against international standards and protections. A statute of limitations of three to five years is in place in Republika Srpska, which also goes against international and domestic policy. In the Federation, the statute of limitations was removed in 2014, however another obstacle continues to be the approx. 2000 KM of lawyer fees that are required to submit a claim, which then reduces the number of claims made. Ms. Ramić concluded people need to be educated that it is important to allow them to talk about these types of crimes and they should not be quiet.
Mr. Kemal Šalaka provided an overview of the work he and his organization have done with veterans of the war who were underage. He estimated that there were a couple of thousand underage fighters in combat during the war. Almost all of the children who fought in the war on all three sides of the conflict did so voluntarily, with Mr. Šalaka stating that over 90% of child soldiers around the world are volunteers who are forced by near circumstance to join to save their own lives. In terms of his own personal involvement in the war in Bosnia, Mr. Šalaka was going to leave two weeks into the war, however he didn’t want it to seem like he was running away and he therefore stayed and fought. He spoke of the Memorial across from the BBI Centar that is dedicated to children who were killed during the war, including 130 child soldiers who died in Sarajevo who were mostly between the ages of 14 and 17. The Association of underage fighters was formed five years ago to correct injustices committed towards the population and to assist underage soldiers in reintegrating into society. These former underage soldiers tend to be less competitive in the labour market due to issues including PTSD and other psychological problems, and are not well received by the government.

Dr. Judith Goldstein started her talk with the fellows by asking what they felt the most provocative aspect of the fellowship had been, as well as what had troubled them the most during the program. For her, the black humour and despair was the most provocative aspect of a country that continues to be divided in all senses. She explained that societies have different ways of coming to terms with heinous crimes, especially genocide and slavery. For Dr. Goldstein, the creation of homogeneous societies after WWII has led to these societies being able to create their own narratives. She termed the current refugee influx to be not a refugee but an integration crisis, and asked the fellows how we should adjust to this way of thinking. Dr. Goldstein believed the Bosnian experience is in fact relevant in other cases. In terms of the work of Humanity in Action, she referred to the active network that exists. She also praised the Bosnian fellows as being an enriching part of the programs they are a part of. She saw what she termed a “horrible past and unfair present” being an American issue.
Mr. Nedim Kulenović conducted a workshop discussing some of the practical and legal aspects of the current migration crisis occurring in the Western Balkans, but that has largely not affected BiH to the extent that it has its neighbors. He mentioned the work of his organization, Vaša Prava BiH, which is the largest organization providing free legal aid in BiH. He provided the fellows an overview of the Schengen Area that exists between members of the European Union, as well as some non-EU countries. Mr. Kulenović also analyzed the data from the UNHCR on refugees and forcibly displaced peoples, with 65.3 million people worldwide being forcibly displaced, 21.3 million refugees and 10 million stateless people across the globe. Only 6% of the world’s displaced peoples are in Europe, compared with numbers as high as 39% in the Middle East and North Africa. Mr. Kulenović also noted the increase in air arrivals by those from Pakistan in BiH. He talked about international legal standards that relate to the treatment of refugees, including Article 1a(2) of the refugee convention of 1957 that states that there must be a “well-founded fear” of being persecuted, with Mr. Kulenović questioning the meaning of this as well as who this includes. In Europe, there is no burden sharing, and individual states are responsible for implementing their own programs. Mr. Kulenović also spoke of programs that have been ruled illegal in asylum cases, included the Czech law that required a test to be performed on people claiming asylum based on sexual orientation.
Mr. Damir Banović spoke to the fellows about LGBT rights in BiH. Family laws in the Federation, Republika Srpska and in Brčko define marriage as being between one man and one woman. He argued that it is better to list all terms associated with the LGBT movement when it comes to rights protection to ensure that all included. Within Bosnia, rights for Lesbians, Gays and Bisexuals are much more advanced than for Transgender people. While article 2 of the BiH constitution prohibits discrimination, sexual orientation, gender identity and sexual characteristics are not included in the list of protected categories. However, gender and sexual identity were included in the Law on Gender Equality in BiH in 2003, Mr. Banović also mentioned that some cases have been referred to the ombudsperson, however there are many people who will not do this as it will require them to come out publicly. He also blamed a lack of education for the perception by some of those who are discriminated against that what they are experiencing is not discrimination. Mr. Banović quoted a study completed in BiH, where 74% of lesbians, 69% of gay men and 61% of bisexuals aged 20 to 30 said they had been exposed to discrimination. In the same survey, 69% of out gay men, 62.5% of lesbians and 50% of bisexuals had lived through some kind of violence. Mr. Banović argued that trans* people are the most discriminated, they may have the right to change their name, but this is a right that all citizens in BiH have. He also spoke of of specific examples of violence towards LGBT people in BiH, specifically in February 2014 and March 2016.
The American Fellows each gave presentations on causes close to them, as well as some of their personal experiences living in the United States. The first presenter described the voter suppression in areas with high African-American populations. This fellow argued that there is a different concept in Southern States of black people. In terms of current legal cases, this fellow spoke to the Supreme court case of Shelby County v. Holder, which was an attempt to allow for the reduction of the number of polling locations in majority black locations by ruling section 5 of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 unconstitutional, which the supreme court did. After a video presentation, the fellow gave personal experiences of voting after this Supreme Court decision, saying that it took over 90 minutes to vote as on campus voting was eliminated. Convicts have also lost the right to vote, which the fellow believed was racialized as statistically 1 in 3 black men will be incarcerated. The fellow also saw a connection between slavery and the mass incarceration currently occurring in America, which has the highest incarceration rate in the world.
The second American fellow spoke of the need to push against the narrative in Islam against women. This fellow has been active in a number of groups at their university, including the interfaith coalition, Black Lives Matter and the Islamic Student Association. The fellow shared their experience at an Islamic School, where sexual urges were taught to be natural but that they could be controlled and acting on these urges is considered a sin. This lead to a state of confusion in the community of the fellow after the legalization of same-sex marriage in the United States. The fellow argued that faith does not mean they cannot love something. For the fellow, doing something instead of talking about something is both painful but possible. Islamophobia continues to be very real in the United States, and the fellow believed that a Trump presidency could affect relations with Muslims and that those in the fellow’s community need to start thinking about what to do if he is elected.

The third American fellow talked about moving from Brazil to the United States six years, and the confusion over terminology that has been experienced in America, especially as it relates to being labelled “Latino” but not considering themselves to be as such, and still being seen as an outsider. The fellow described the fact that they were influenced by growing up in a smaller town rather than one of the larger cities in Brazil such as Rio de Janeiro or São Paolo. In Brazil, skin colour is not a culture or sense of identity, to which the fellow used the example of Carnival as a mixture of Portuguese and Afro-Brazilian cultures. The feeling of being different in Brazil came from socio-economic conditions and not from race. However, in the late 1800s and early 1900s, Brazil’s government encourage inter-marriages between black and white Brazilians in order to “whiten” the race, which was seen as countering Black heritage by diluting it. For the fellow, race and racial identification are so important in America. The fellow also addressed the differences within America, specifically between New York and Los Angeles, and how in Los Angeles it was assumed that they were Hispanic and Mexican, which is the generic term used for people from south of the U.S.

The final American fellow analyzed their identity in terms of being considered Antiguan as opposed to being considered black. The fellow spoke of learning about being a black woman in the United States, as well as the racist history of their home state of Oregon and how the fellow’s parents experienced this first hand in buying a home there. The fellow presented clips from Beyoncé’s new video “Lemonade”, which the fellow termed a collective “yes” to black female identities. The fellow argued that the “angry black woman” stereotype has held people back in professional situations. Finally, the fellow shared personal stories of experiencing racism, including at their college where graffiti that states “black girls are hot, just not at Colgate” was found in one of the bathrooms at the school.
The European Fellows split their presentation into three overarching themes: minorities, nationalism and the refugee crisis. The first fellow spoke of minorities in France, and their perception as being a part of one of these minorities. The fellow never felt different in any way at a young age and was aware of diversity. However, the fellow pointed out there is a huge difference between Banlieusardes, or those from the suburbs of Paris, and Parisians. The fellow was the first from their high school to attend Sciences Po, which is considered the school where people go to shape French people. The fellow talked about inequalities they have seen in person, as well as the violence and riots that occurred in 2005. The fellow described a shift that has occurred since the celebration of a diverse Euro 1998 team to racial profiling by police officers. The second fellow spoke of minorities in the Netherlands, and they argued that the liberal perception of the Netherlands has allowed for a blind spot to be created in this respect. The fellow gave the example of a politician in the Netherlands being caught on a hot mic saying an offensive term towards Moroccans. This, the fellow argued, is one aspect of the negative perception of Moroccans, with many jokes also being made about Dutch people of Moroccan origin. The fellow felt that it has been difficult to come to terms with being both Dutch and Moroccan. One politician, Geert Wilders, has been sued by a group of Moroccan Dutch for some of the things he has said about the group. The fellow also mentioned the example of Zwarte Piet, who is usually portrayed in black face, and how Dutch people feel that attacks against Zwarte are attacks on their culture.
On nationalism in each of their countries, the fellows analyzed specific examples in France, the United Kingdom and Germany. In France, it has been mandatory to teach slavery since 2001. In terms of relations with overseas territories, the veil law put in place impacted these territories, especially those with high Muslim populations. One of the French fellows described the perception of Sciences Po as being full of the high class and city folk, and how moving to a city caused them to question their homogeneous upbringing. Their childhood friends have also expressed support for the nationalist party Front National. They also expressed frustration at the French identity, as it prevents diversity in certain places. On the United Kingdom, our British fellow explained how they were not educated on the British Empire until the age of 18. They also spoke of the support for the United Kingdom Independence Party or UKIP, which tends to be concentrated in areas with less people who were born abroad. The fellow also showed a poster used by UKIP and compared it to the anti-Jewish sentiment that was prevalent in Europe prior to WWII. Our German fellow explained the Alliance for Germany or AfD, which has risen in prominence recently, as well as spikes in Anti-Muslim racism.

Speaking on the refugee crisis, our British and German fellows gave personal stories of working with those fleeing conflicts in their home countries. The British fellow talked about their visits to detention centres, as well as the story of someone whom she met who was deported from the UK even though he had family there as the government argued he “can see them over Skype”. They also elaborated on the oversubscribed housing in Paris, which has led to many people living in the street. The German fellow described their experience in working in a part in Hannover with Sudanese refugees, in a tent city they made it to being. They termed this a vibrant community. The refugees have since been removed from the park, and the fellow expressed hope that the circles of support created there survive. In their work with NGOs, the fellow shared examples of working with an Afghan who walked overland to Germany over two years, only to have his asylum claim rejected. The fellow also talked about how mass graves have been used to dispose of the bodies of those who die in the Mediterranean, and as a result of this the fellow has participated in a project where crosses are placed around Germany as a sign of protest to address the fatalities occurring.
The fellows first excursion out of Sarajevo was to the town of Konjic, in Herzegovina. The first stop was the centre of Konjic, where the fellows were able to explore the area around the Old Stone Bridge. This was followed by a visit to Tito’s Bunker, where fellows were given a guided tour of this Cold War relic found during the war that included special rooms for Josip Broz Tito and his staff. Fellows were also able to see a number of art installations that were located in many of the former offices and sleeping quarters of the bunker. An interesting fact was that the bunker itself is still in use, with a meeting of army staff taking place there in the weeks prior to our visit. Following the visit to the bunker, fellows were driven to Boračko Lake south of Konjic for lunch and time to relax by the lake before heading back to Sarajevo at the end of the afternoon.
The fellows explored the different religious institutions that exist in Sarajevo. First, they visited the Catholic Cathedral, where fellows learned about the Catholic community in Sarajevo. This was followed by a visit to the Jewish Museum, which served as one of the original synagogues in Sarajevo, where our guide explained to us some of the important architectural aspects. Third, we visited the Old Orthodox Church in Sarajevo, which dates back to the 16th century. After a quick lunch break, the fellows were given a talk by a member of our Board of Directors, Dr. Elijas Tauber, at the Sarajevo Synagogue, on the history of the Jewish Community in Sarajevo, as well as sharing stories of Jews giving their IDs to those fleeing Sarajevo through the tunnel by the airport. Finally, fellows visited the Gazi Husrev-beg Mosque, where fellows were able to learn more about the Muslim community in BiH.
Gen. Divjak is a retired General in the Bosnian Army who served as the Deputy Commander for the Army's Main Staff until 1994 during the Bosnian War. He is currently Executive Director of “Education Builds Bosnia and Herzegovina”, which he co-founded in 1994.

Gen. Jovan Divjak guided the fellows through two important sights from Sieged Sarajevo. The first was the Sarajevo Tunnel, which was used during the war to transport supplies in and out of the city. Fellows were able to walk through a small portion of the tunnel and watch film footage of the tunnel being used during the war.

The second stop was the old Jewish Cemetery, located on a hill above the city, which was used by both sides of the conflict. Here, Gen. Divjak shared some personal stories from the war with the fellows, including stories of a woman he assisted who has continued to keep in contact with him. Gen. Divjak departed after the cemetery and the fellows were taken to the Yellow Fortress for lunch with a view over Sarajevo.
A House Divided: Cities Under Tension and Segregation
Trip to Stolac and Mostar

The Fellows had an organized tour with Gorčin Dizdar, Ph.D., HIA Fellow, to the Radimlja Medieval Necropolis (UNESCO World Heritage Site), the city-centre of Stolac, and Mak’s Art House.

A talk on current political and social challenges on divided cities with Demir Mahmutćehajić, member of the city council in Stolac, at Mak’s Art House.

A visit to the United World College in Mostar, with Dženan Hakalović, a history teacher at the school.

A workshop at the Partisan Cemetery in Mostar and a guided tour of Mostar with Marko Barišić, archaeologist and HIA Fellow.
The third study visit of the fellowship was an incredibly moving visit to the Memorial Center Srebrenica-Potočari, the site of the genocide that occurred during the war in 1995. Fellows were able to explore the graveyard where thousands of victims of the genocide have been buried and continue to be buried there on the anniversary of the start of the genocide each 11th of July. Following this, the fellows were given a history of the memorial centre by Mrs. Amra Begić Fazlić, the head curator of the centre, who also shared her own stories of losing family in the genocide. Fellows explored the Memorial Hall, which was used as the headquarters of the UN in Srebrenica and which now contains photographs detailing the crimes that took place right outside of the building. They were then shown a film, which documented the genocide using film footage.
Mr. Ramiz Kadić, deputy mayor for sport, culture and education, spoke to the fellows about the current situation in the city of Sarajevo, and the relationship the city has with other bodies of government in BiH. Mr. Kadić believed a post-conflict society can only be constructed by young people in Sarajevo and in BiH as they are not affected by ethnic lines. He noted that BiH is the European country with the most levels of government, with over 200 ministers for the entire country. He called for a change in the constitution to ensure equality for all BiH citizens both politically and economically. The education should also be reformed according to Mr. Kadić, including the elimination of the current two schools under one roof system. In terms of the work done at the city government, Mr. Kadić explained some of the current realities, including that the Canton needs to approve anything the city wants to do, which he believed was not the correct way of doing things as citizens should be able to get services from the closest level of government to them. This resulted in projects such as the reconstruction of the old City Hall being completed without financial assistance from the Canton.
Ms. Melina Kamerić from the PR department at Al Jazeera Balkans spoke to the fellows about the station’s role in broadcasting the news in the Balkan region. At Al Jazeera Balkans, newscasters only give the news not their opinions, with no use of terms such as “fortunately” or “unfortunately”. Al Jazeera Balkans has offices throughout the region, with newscasters speaking the local language in each of the areas except Kosovo. The channel was established in 2011 and is funded by the Al Jazeera media network, meaning it is not dependent on advertisers and political actors. 2 political leaders in the region have refused to go on the network, including the ex-Mayor of Belgrade who wouldn’t talk to foreign media. One letter compliant has also been received from a political party in BiH. Al Jazeera Balkans is leading the region in terms of social media presence according to Ms. Kamerić. In the case of Kosovo, while it is recognized as an independent state by Al Jazeera English, a compromise was made by Al Jazeera Balkans, with dots separating Kosovo and Serbia. This is one of a number of compromises that need to be made in the region.

Ms. Suzana Stambol, Executive Producer at N1, spoke to the fellows about how N1 reports on breaking news in Bosnia and the surrounding area. N1 has been on the air since October of 2014 and is the first 24-hour regional news channel. N1 is also the exclusive CNN partner for the region. It contains both regional and national content as well as both web and television content, which is different from the other television networks in the region. This also makes them the most complicated news platform in BiH. Ms. Stambol argued that it is much easier to go live today than it was a few years ago where more planning was required. N1 has no influences from the outside or political pressures, as it is not a public channel or a commercial channel, but it is not like other commercial channels dependent on money from companies and who therefore won’t publish certain stories. They receive funding from the KKR fund, a group from Belgrade. N1 has also received an award for LGBT reporting.
Mr. Boris Grubešić, PR officer, and Dr. Mirza Hukeljić, State Prosecutor, spoke to the fellows on topics relating to the work done at the state level in prosecuting crimes, including crimes committed during the war. Mr. Grubešić provided an overview of the office, including that there are 550 employees at state level institutions. Of this, 56 prosecutors work in three departments; the Special Department for War Crimes, the Special Department for Organized Crime, Economic Crime and Corruption, and Department III, each of which contains different sections working on different crimes under these umbrellas. The State Prosecutor’s Office started work in early 2003 with only 4 prosecutors. Prosecutorial teams cover between 20 and 30 municipalities and, since 2013, all of them are from BiH. The Special Department for War Crimes has made over 606 indictments relating to serious violations of International Humanitarian Law. Over half of the employees at the office are women, and they have been gender sensitive since their founding. The have also cooperated with civil society initiatives and citizen associations, including associations of victims during war crimes cases.

Dr. Mirza Hukeljić, has worked for the State Prosecutor’s Office of BiH since 2013. Previous to this, he was the Head of the Department for War Crimes for the district of East Sarajevo starting in 2010, in addition to his work as a lawyer for the Office of the High Representative from 2003 to 2005. Dr. Hukeljić, one of the youngest prosecutors in the country having been appointed at the age of 33, spoke about some of the work he specifically has worked on in his time at the State Prosecutor’s Office. He spent five years working on war crimes, which he considered quite a long time, and is currently working in the organized crime division. During his time working on war crimes, he focused on sexual crimes, which are some of the most severe crimes to occur in BiH. He talked about the relationship the State Prosecutor’s Office has with the ICTY, including the benchmark verdicts made by the ICTY related to genocide that states that the intention to commit genocide makes it a different type of crime. The ICTY is also the only jurisprudence that affects the work of the court of BiH.
The final study visit the fellows had during the fellowship was to two of the city’s museums: the National Museum and the Historical Museum of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

Ms. Marica Filipović, the Deputy Director of the National Museum of BiH, spoke to the fellows about the history of the museum, as well as the challenges they are currently experiencing in keeping the museum open. Ms. Filipović pointed out a crucial flaw of the Dayton Agreement, in that it did not solve the question of state funding of institutions, including the museum. Besides the complicated structure of the financing, main problems arose after the 2010 election, as the funding for the museum was cut for 2011 and, after one year without funding and with employees not being paid, the Museum closed in the fall of 2012. She mentioned the Culture Shutdown movement started in 2014 as a global movement by a Bosnian-American professor, which was followed by the #JaSamMuzej (#IAmTheMuseum) movement in 2015. The museum reopened on September 15, 2015 with financial support for one year.

During the visit to the Historical Museum, the Fellows had a guided tour of the permanent exhibit on the Siege of Sarajevo, as well as an exhibit about life in former Yugoslavia.
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**Georgia Soares** with Juju Vainqueur.
June 24 - via

I was lucky to live in Sarajevo with these two incredible girls for a month. Thank you for all the great moments we shared together, and I hope that after the fellowship we'll reunite in England and France! #HIASarajevo2016

[Photo of three women smiling]

@Jasmin Z. Hasic, Elma Bešić and 42 others 3 Comments

**Tasneem Maner** in Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina.
July 4 - Instagram

Back in the States, but left my heart in Bosnia. #HIASarajevo2016 #grateful #sorrynotsorry for all the pics

[Photo of a scenic cityscape]

@Berina Verlašević, Sarah FW and 46 others 1 Comment

**Elma Bešić** added 8 new photos — feeling proud in Stolac.
June 6 - via

What a great honor to have tour with Mehmedalić Mek Dizdar's grandson Gorčin Dizdar and once again visit this beautiful parts of BiH!!! #Radicja #Stolac #Mek's Art House #nofilter #HIASarajevo2016
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>> S porozom najavljeno održavanje inauguralnog Humanity in Action BH Summer Fellowship u Sarajevu, od 27.05 - 26.06. 2016. godine. HIA BH tim se istrožno zahvaljuje svima koji su podržali ovaj projekt, a posebno DSF BH. Hvala prisvuda svim način SF's koji su dati svoj doprinos projektu, te drugim uživačima koji su nam ponog u doziranju ovog fellowship postara. Mirza Saponić, te Dženeti Karabegović i Manji Miloš.

Laura Cahier shared Humanity in Action Bosnia and Herzegovina's photo.
June 22 · 11

Celebrating a challenging and inspiring month in Sarajevo with an amazing and lovely team.

Georgia Squires
June 21 · 8

View on Instagram
21st birthday with the best crew. Thank you for making my day so special. ❤️ with @juzjuz, @zorana, @danisa, @zaferic, @jasminh, @mike, @lauracahier and many more. A special mention to those who couldn't be there.

Juju Vainqueur with Jasmin Z. Hasic and 8 others in Stolac.
June 9 · 8

Selfie of the 11th Day! #HIAinSarajevo2016

Sarah Piw, Ivana Kešić and 28 others
2 Comments

encourage diversity.
“Despite the fact that I was aware of the importance of creating a HIA fellowship in the Balkans, I did not know what to expect. Considering the curiosity and lack of preconceptions, I was curious to know more about the human rights landscape and the social justice issues affecting a country that was often left out of my studies. The fellowship offered us a clear, relevant and multidimensional overview of the situation of the country, while constantly referring to the human rights challenges and peace building strategies at stake, nationally and internationally. The great diversity of the lectures was a real strength of this fellowship. It allowed us to learn about many different topics with a multidisciplinary approach – sociology, law, economics, political science, history, psychology, anthropology and even musicology. Among many interesting and insightful visits, we went to Mostar to visit a segregated school that showed the complexity of the “two schools under one roof” policy, to the Srebrenica Genocide Memorial and to the mayor’s office of Sarajevo. We were also lucky to meet people with very different backgrounds and who played various roles within the Bosnian society, like the former football player Predrag Pašić, and the High Representative of Bosnia and Herzegovina Valentin Inzko. This allowed us to develop a complex, nuanced and dynamic overview of human rights challenges in the country.”

Laura Cahier, France

“Humanity in Action was what I expected it to be, a very intense program, where good friendships with likeminded and interesting people are formed. The people I met gave me inspiration to keep on caring about human rights issues, even when it might seem difficult to do so at times. There are several things that stayed on my mind after having participated in the first summer program in Bosnia. First and foremost I would like to express my deep appreciation for all the program staff of HiA Bosnia for putting their soul into this program. Perhaps because this was the first year of the Bosnian program, or perhaps every program had such caring staff, but I sincerely felt the effort that was made to make myself and everyone else feel comfortable in Sarajevo. I felt extremely welcomed, and this definitely had to do with the staff’s commitment to the program.”

Zaynab Lasshab, The Netherlands

“The overall structure and thematic content of the Humanity in Action program in Sarajevo was great. We had an overall picture of the most present issues arguing in this country after a whole month of this program. I observed this structure immediately at the beginning and I was discussing with other fellows about the structure of the fellowship, so I think the overall structure was great – it had a beginning, a core and no ending. Since, there is no ending to stop discussing such topics. Those topics which were the thematic content were briefly discussed from different angles – academic, activist or experienced people from different fields such as political and social, economy, art, sport, etc. Lectures and site visits were well chosen. Thank you HUMANITY IN ACTION. Thank you for meeting all speakers to whom I stayed in contact. Thank you for meeting new friends and future partners. Thank you for another adventure which HIA provided. Thank you for letting me be officially part of the HIA family”

Berina Verlašević, Bosnia and Herzegovina

“A few days after I returned from my trip, my mom said to me “I feel like even my own perception of the world has changed from your travels.” During the duration of my trip, I shared the articles about Bosnian political and social situations with her. I updated her occasionally with new facts that I learned about Bosnian cuisine and culture. From across an ocean, she got excited over cevapi and learned for the first time about the three major ethnic groups in Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH) and their implications in genocide. If she was that in awe of my experience, I cannot even begin to explain how life-changing this experience has been for me. Additionally, I have already realized the power of communication and sharing the knowledge I have gained. With friends and relatives I have peaked new interest in Bosnia, a country that generally felt it was forgotten by the world in times of war.”

Tasneem Maner, United States
“Regardless of the country context, the HIA fellowship is a unique opportunity for one to a) engage in a short, intensive educational programme, b) connect with young activists, and c) maintain a productive, action-oriented goal of implementing an Action Project. Studying in Bosnia was a fascinating glimpse into the struggles of a post-conflict society. The lectures and site visits in Bosnia were very well chosen. We were able to talk to individuals from the public and private sector, the media, the international community, the Bosnian diaspora and so on. The site visits were vital for us to see in person the memorials of the tragedies that we were touched upon in class. I was able to learn much about challenges in a post conflict society. Thank you for the fantastic, humbling, and inspirational experience. I am excited to carry out my Action Project and to remain in contact with the HIA staff and fellows.”

Tiffany Shakespeare, United Kingdom

“My experience as a Humanity in Action Fellow in Bosnia and Herzegovina this year was one that was incredibly challenging, eye-opening, and rewarding. As a fellow, I was challenged to get outside of my own American perspective, interrogate my own assumptions, and was encouraged to question why I am knowledgeable about certain information and not others. This was facilitated through a group of hard-working, insightful staff and facilitators, open and brilliant fellows, and an intense schedule that demanded jumping full into the experience of learning and unlearning. I had the opportunity to learn from many scholars as well as see first-hand many of the sights giving depth to many of the discussions we had. From education to law to art, I was given many lenses with which to critical engage with historical and current issues in Bosnia and Herzegovina. These lectures and site visits were supplemented by complex discussion among fellows as well as local events to learn about Sarajevo. The program as a whole was very academically well-rounded and provided an intellectual framework that connected issues in Bosnia and Herzegovina to past and current global issues. Understanding the ways in which a context such a Bosnia and Herzegovina—which coming from the U.S. race-focused context appeared somewhat homogenous—can also face some of the same issues in ethnic tensions and divisions as the U.S. was very interesting. This expanded my own understanding of race and ethnicity and I’m very grateful for this.”

Alexandria Dyer, United States

“As a Bosnian fellow I was a bit skeptic regarding the program as I have had already the opportunity to examine all the topics that were planned to be presented in the Program. But at the end of fellowship I can say that there was no space for the skepticism. Fellowship turned to be one of the most amazing extracurricular activities in which I participated since my university education. I appreciate a time that was provided for foreign fellows in presenting issues in their countries. That was very interesting. It is my strong recommendation to give more time for them next year in order to understand a complexity of human rights challenges in their countries.”

Harun Išerić, Bosnia and Herzegovina

“I have never done a fellowship before. However, after my semester abroad I have seen so many fellowship proposal in the US, that it really intrigued me. I did not know what to expect but the fraternity and community aspect. Thus, I have not been disappointed. I have meet amazing and smart people and create a sincere bound with them. Thought them I have learn more about their countries, them and how I can improve my understanding and respect toward others. And if we add all the learning around Bosnia, I have learn a lot through the 25 days, and I am so grateful for that. Beside a better understanding of European geopolitics and Bosnia, I grew up so much being everyday around people from different countries, and backgrounds. By sharing their visions, experiences and knowledge, they made me richer somehow, more respectful and eager to know about people and the world. I especially loved the site visits. It gave us a chance to have a break from the classroom and to change the learning process dynamic.”

Julie Vainqueur, France
After spending one month in Bosnia – what did I learn?

Armin Wühle

In one of our lectures, Historian Nicolas Moll talked about two traps people often fall into when interpreting history or present socio-political conditions. The first trap: to think that everything is black & white. The second trap: to think that everything is grey. This seems to be a paradox only at first glance, whereas it captures a very important truth. A lot of people tend to narrate history and the present along understandable narratives, having ‘the good’ and ‘the bad’ ones. Doing that, they almost always render differences and mutual contributions to a given situation. Reality is rarely easy and understandable – reality is complex and intertwined (in the era of globalization more than ever) and can hardly be captured in friend & foe schemes. Often, it’s a lack of empathy for the other side that triggers people into those portrayals, whereas walking in the shoes of our opponents might help to adjust them. But another trap is to balance out two sides of a story until everything is grey. We might get stuck in the grey zone, jumping from one side to the other and staying passive while severe crimes are happening right before our eyes. Influential intellectuals in the 90s argued not to intervene in Bosnia, because human rights violations were reported from both fighting sides. In the meantime, genocides in Srebrenica and Prijedor took place, concentration camps were erected, thousands of women were systemically raped in rape camps, all classic examples for the horrible consequences of staying in the grey zone. Those intellectuals neglected the fact that the main target group of all atrocities were Bosniak Muslims (and their almost unarmed army) while the main perpetrator was a well-equipped Serb army – they lost themselves in balancing out and therefore lost grip of reality.

So how to position yourself between rejecting “black & white” and rejecting “everything is grey”? The answer is as simple as it is disillusioning. It’s simple, because we only need to take facts seriously: if we shift our focus to ‘what is done’ instead of ‘who has done it’ and stick to facts, neither one side or the other will be totally relieved or condemned. But the answer is also disillusioning: even facts have to be interpreted and facts have to be selected, which paves the way to subjectivity and falsification again. So, maybe Moll’s statement is a paradox to some degree, and I often catch myself getting lost between two oppositional points. But this doesn’t mean that his statement is wrong – it makes it simply harder for us to avoid both traps.

Back to my initial question – what did I learn after spending one month in Bosnia? More than this single comment could ever express, that’s for sure. But at least this: portraying history and the present as black & white leads us to generalisations and divisions, to violence and hate, complicates reconciliation and enforces a portrayal of our fellow human beings as enemies, rather than to perceive them as our brothers and sisters who share the same feelings, urges, fears and dreams. In the same time, a portrayal of history and present as inherently grey makes it hard to challenge oppression and re-establishing peace and equality. So maybe we should choose a side, take a stand, but frequently re-question our position and strive to walk in the shoes of those who we perceive as our opponents. At least, I guess this is what comes closest to a solution of Moll’s paradox.
Reflections on Bosnia

Ernest Britt

One of the most informative conversations I had while in Bosnia took place on the tram, of all places. Loke and I were headed back to Ilidza when a man walked on the tram to check our tickets. This was the second check of the trip, which was a bit unusual so late at night. We both commented on this, and the blond kid in front of us (who had just entered the tram) jokingly suggested it was his fault because they always check when he’s on the tram. I noticed he had a textbook with an English title so we all started talking. He told us he was in his last year of high school, about his classes, about how ridiculously strict his English teacher was, about the scholarship he was hoping to receive, and complained about how corrupt the entire system was. His dad was a firefighter; his mom, a teacher. But what really stood out to me (aside from his nearly flawless English) was the fact that as he complained about the BiH government, he grouped himself and all Bosnians with it. Instead of saying “the government is corrupt” or broken, or complicated, or ineffective, he said “we.” “The problem with us here in Bosnia...”

Complaining about the government is a popular pastime in every country, the United States included. But here, we highlight the government’s issues by distancing ourselves from it. We say “Congress is ineffective.” We say “Washington, DC is corrupt.” It becomes an issue of “us” (the regular folk who are good) and “them” (the self-interested, out of touch politicians). We separate ourselves semantically from the problems of government but gladly take ownership for its successes. Sure, the most skeptical among us may say things like “America is corrupt” or “that’s just the way things are here” or “we’re part of the issue.” We do claim to be a democracy, after all.

But what does it mean to lump yourself in with what many people consider to be the worst actors in a society - politicians? Does it mean you take partial responsibility for their failures, or does it mean you’ve resigned yourself to going with the flow? I guess it all depends on where you think solutions will originate from. If you believe they’ll originate from within the system, calling the government “us” could be positive. It suggests that “we” may have made this mess, but we’ll do our best to fix it. If you believe problems are solved by outside forces or actors, calling the government “us” is apathy at its worst. It seems to say “This is just the way things are, and we’ll wait until someone solves this problem for us.”

I don’t know which side this high schooler was on, but after a month in BiH I learned that most of the country’s problems were created by outside forces - or, at least the initial cause of many of BiH’s current struggles were formed by external actors. Is it unrealistic to hold the people of the country wholly in charge of fixing present and past blunders? I’m not sure. I guess it all depends on perspective and attitude. Are the problems “us vs. them” or do we share responsibility for fixing them? The good news is, most of the other young people I talked to (especially at the Slobodna Zona on one sunny afternoon) were optimistic in spite of a society that seems to be stacked against them. Our country has problems, they acknowledge, but we can still do something to make it a better place.
Human Rights between Theory and Experience

Loke Bisbjerg Nielsen

When facing grave human rights violations, our emotions are stirred, our sense of injustice triggered and a call for action resonates through our mind and body: something must be done. By learning about and experiencing – although by proxy – the pain and suffering of individuals or groups, we sympathise with and even recognise parts of ourselves in them. Suffering is thus given human faces, stories and expressions. It is relayed to its audience as embodied reflections: the heaviness of sadness, nausea, a sense of discomfort. It is translated into inner discourses and questions: how can this happen? What can be done? In other words, we are compelled to understand and to act.

In trying to understand, we find ourselves engaging in intellectual or academic discourse: examining the meaning of concepts, analysing social, economic or other structures, understanding historical developments, the human psyche, the intricacies of law, strategy, decision-making etc. In doing this we go beyond the particularities of experience and deal in abstractions, universals, comparisons and generalisations. In this there is an inherent danger of losing or diminishing the concrete suffering of those affected. The story of Davi, whose two children were killed while he watched, and was then forced to dig the mass grave they were shot into, but who survived the shooting and spent two days hiding under the dead bodies drenched in filth and blood, is abstracted to a discourse on trauma or resilience, humanitarian interventions, the meaning of the term ‘genocide’ or a history of a conflict. The story of Davi becomes a number, an example, a case study.

In addition, people affected by tragedy, whether directly or through affiliation, are rarely interested in academic discourses, but can perceive discourse as a gross offence to their lived experiences. The question ‘was it a genocide’, ‘how did the implementation of the no-fly zone affect the outcome of the war’ or ‘what is ethnicity’ do often not make sense to people affected and can function as a further violation. If someone says ‘I experienced genocide’ it should be considered a violation to then ask that person to first define it. In already struggling to articulate the experience of suffering it is a violation to remove the limited vocabularies often available to victims. Furthermore it is a violation in itself to make suffering abstract. It sanitises its horror, detaches it from emotions and feelings of discomfort and tries to make something “objective” which lies at the extreme end of subjective experience. It dehumanises the victims by abstracting their particularity to samples, numbers, concepts or theories.

The mastery and privilege performed by the abstraction of academic discourse over the particularities of subjective experience compels us to conclude that it is both dangerous and obsolete. But in wanting to learn and understand, it is difficult to avoid abstractions and generalisations, as our experience and knowledge need to be organised, processed, and understood; a language to communicate tragedy must often be developed. These needs are translated into frameworks for action and prevention. Whether developing policies or laws, calling for interventions, communicating to powerful institutions and policymakers or applying an experience from one setting to another, concepts need to be analysed, knowledge organised and experience abstracted. If experience was our only point of reference we would possibly find ourselves incapable of understanding systems, rather than instances, of oppression, trajectories of historical developments, similarities between particular forms of suffering and discrimination or to understand how and why we can improve, change and prevent. It takes courage to go into the physical and mental discomfort of learning about suffering and tragedy. But as outsiders there is a limit to what we can learn from experience alone. To learn that suffering is there, that it exists, and that it is a world of horror, often does not make you capable of understanding why it is there, or how, or what can be done. Furthermore, as outsiders learning about tragedies, we need to be able to convey experiences to outside audiences. This requires abstraction and theoretical reflections.

In order to limit the mastery of theory it is necessary to let particularity speak, to step back and listen, and never to allow theoretical considerations to lose sight of what they are considerations about, namely particularities. A theory is required to resonate in concrete experience by lending a voice and providing vocabularies to articulate suffering in its specificity. Furthermore, abstraction has another dimension. Not only is the mental removal from particularity challenged by dehumanisation, it also provides an arena where alternative thinking is possible. When facing reality we can find ourselves pacified by the structures in place: economic, social, institutional etc. Theory offers a possible entrance point to break those structures through analysis, reconsideration and by, on a metaphysical level, to go beyond, besides, above or below them. In other words: to dream.
The name of the text is “Question mark”. If you noticed it begins with the ellipses though. Why? This is going to be your first “why” if you continue reading this “puzzle”. In the end, it will be your “because”, too. In the same time, it is both a question and an answer as well.

During HIA (Humanity in Action) Summer Fellowship Sarajevo 2016 I was a local fellow. Being a local fellow, the fellowship was done from a different perspective. All topics and almost all speakers were known to me; so going and digging in the positive and negative spheres of my small country Bosnia and Herzegovina (B&H) was inspiring. Why? Constantly surrounded by upsides and downsides I found a solution by calling it “inspiring”.

Being a student in B&H. Declaring myself as a citizen of B&H even though I was not born there. Being active all my life. Volunteering for the last seven years actively. Being 22 years old. I am a young individual living for a life in B&H. Why?

Bosnia and Herzegovina is an extravagant country with even more extra-extra-extravagant lifestyle.

Who carries the change? Who can hold the change? Who aggregates and channel group interests? Ethnic party systems have so many drawbacks; so why do they still prevail in many divided societies? The system is OK, but physically separated? Consequences? Are you serious?

Those are some of the questions which successful individuals are asking us.

It is an extravagant country. A vital part of the equation of moving on is youth. For them to fight and want to be part of politics instead breaking the politics. When ethnic (party) politics have so much access to the power. Ethnicity defined by territory is down. Very creative politicians who use instruments of production of change. No channeling right anger. When we say that there is no alternative, then our brain stops functioning.

Protection of our own groups. In B&H we look the same; we speak the same language; we live together.

Men defended the city of Sarajevo during war while women saved this city. Commonweal. Connecting people – everyone is singing. To push the concept of the communication. We are public and we have a duty to work on it. Cultural heritage, (religious) history and geographical position. Now, these schools have the aim of putting people in the boxes. Level of intellectual engagement. Intent guided by skill. Sometimes people choose other names to fit better. This is not a history; but it is a part of the history.

Those are some of the answers which were said by successful individuals.

I asked question. I got an answer. I asked question, again. I got the answer. I did not ask question again. I got the answer. Asking or not; people with power in B&H have answers all the time. Time goes on. I am growing.

I do not have an answer all the time – isn’t that a positive thing?

But...

I do not have a question all the time – is that a positive thing?

Being part of this fellowship gave me an opportunity to start recognizing where the “pieces of puzzle” should be placed. I am interested in finding the outcome.

... You will find out if I succeed or not.
A More Beautiful Lens: Analyzing War and Genocide through Theater and Art

Tasneem Maner

Intro: lecture that caught my interest is Sarajevo War Theater because I was surprised by how much I related to his messages and how much they related to other lectures and site visits. In program that I initially believed would explore current social structures through political and historical lenses, I was pleasantly surprised that the program explored broader fields especially including art and theater.

Aim of art: “push the concept of communication as something society needs”. Personally view communication as the most important factor of understanding history and progressing from it.

From his speech specifically: The artistic community has realized the importance of talking openly about oppression, personal experiences, history, and genocide. Bosnia has become more open to these topics after the war, and thus positivity emerges from events as terrible as war.

In conditions of war, things are more radical and intense. The war in Bosnia was the first war in which torture and mass murder were captured on the phones and cameras of ordinary men. In a new era of technology there was no censorship during the war. Such conditions instigated heart wrenched responses from the Bosnian people, and people are more willing to communicate soulfully, via writing, creating technology, theater, and media.

On another level, that media communicates to the Bosnian public, and changes external attitudes towards Bosnia as well. The Sarajevo War Theater specifically features productions derived from experiences of the war itself, and communicates them realistically. Lamenting the genocide alone is not enough, and he has focused his career on the intersectionality between technology and humanity.

Furthermore, after the war he realized that history is written by the winners, and because Bosnia has three winners of the war, three histories now exist. The artistic community, unlike institutional structure like “2 schools under one roof” are willing to address the complexities rather than ignore and separate them. Issues too complicated are beyond help, ie in the case of justice for the families of Srebrenica genocide victims: “Well Serbs were dying too.”... And throughout this program, I was often personally exhausted by the number of speakers that pointed fingers at complexity and other systems. There was often an underlying rhetoric of hopelessness and blame that made peace among the three ethnic groups in BiH impossible to imagine. His talk was refreshing for this reason. Outside of the realm of corrupt politics and rigid social science, there was revitalizing art. Again personal stories in theater and talking openly about pain and death are vital to humanizing complex issues.

Interesting point about how in the media, people empathize less when the victims are different or less attractive. The application of these behavioral patterns are evident in some of the most effective art we viewed during our fellowship (Bosnian girl).

His talk was also very relatable to other favorite speakers and site visits during the fellowship, revealing much about the importance of art in Sarajevo and all of Bosnia.

Evident in sites as simple as Tito’s Bunker repurposed as an art gallery, and the National and Historical Museums using art as a medium to share information about the Siege and earlier histories.

Music in the Sevdah House.

Art show with Berina, Berina’s friend = my favorite memories and what I bring back to America when I talk about BiH.
In the Paper I will reflect on the lecture by Armela Ramić: „Seeking justice for women war victims.“ I have chosen this lecture to present as I find it as one of the most interesting and informative for me during whole fellowship.

More than 50,000 women were victims of rape and sexual violence during war in Bosnia and Herzegovina. These women are stigmatized and they live on the margins of society. There were only 15 cases prosecuted before courts in Bosnia and Herzegovina for sexual violence during war. Land marking cases were: Savić and Marković before Court of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

Challenges which women victims of war face in criminal procedures are: issues of witness protection, as prosecutors are saying that no judges will believe to the witness that is protected one and that in case it is very hard to win the case; assistance to the victim during the trial, as there is deficit number of trained staff in the courts and finally access to the information, as victims are not informed about the case and its development. One big disadvantage when it comes to procedure before Court of Bosnia and Herzegovina is absence of the Law on free legal aid on level of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

When it comes to right to the compensations, it can be achieved in criminal or civil procedure. Justifying it as attempt to prevent delay of criminal procedure, courts instruct victims to claim compensation in civil procedure. The main challenges in civil procedure are: procedure is very costly and long; revelation of the identity, in case that claimant is a protected witness it would have to write its personal date in a claim and by that commit and crime which is revelation of identity of secret witness; limitation period for exercise of the right for compensation as by courts it is considered to be 3 and 5 years; if case is lost, claimant, which is woman victim of the war, has to bear costs of the court proceedings and finally the issues is also execution of the judgments.

One of issues regarding B&H legislation is a fact that a rape in according the Criminal Code of B&H requests a force to be proven, while international standards do not. As most of compensations are not charged, Bosnia and Herzegovina should establish a national fond from which these compensations would be paid.

At the end, I have to say that to me as a lawyer, this lecture was one of most inspiring and most probably it will affect my future studies and work.
Bureaucratic Entrapment in Bosnia

Tiffany Shakespeare

Bureaucracy is the rule of nobody. Arendt, 1970

1 state, 2 entities, 3 presidents, 3 constituent peoples, 10 cantons, 13 prime ministers, 127 registered political parties, 136 ministries, 180 ministers, 7000 MPs. Bosnia’s development seems to be stunted by its own bureaucracy. Its bloated public sector diffuses responsibility and dilutes accountability. Drowned in bureaucratic inefficiency, progressive reforms are difficult to enforce and corruption festers.

One must be alive in government notebooks to be living. Unless government officials say that you are alive, you may go on forever screaming that you are alive, only to console yourself. A. Nesin, 1995

ID cards, 2013. In 2013, the government ruled that babies born since mid-February could not be registered with authorities. This lost them their right to health insurance and other entitlements. Without a passport, one is devoid of legal personhood and their official binding to the nation-state in which they reside. Many scholars have theorised the absence of a passport, as the loss of the right to have rights (Arendt, 1951). This is pertinent in the Bosnian case, as one baby tragically died due to its inability to acquire healthcare that stemmed from its exclusion from the official governmental registers.

Nepotism. The continual political bickering in government where everyone is in charge, breeds a norm of corruption. Politicians can reap the benefits of their secure occupation and offer jobs to family members or others from the same ethnic group. Whilst the borders of governmental bureaucracy are porous for those who know someone on the inside, they are difficult to penetrate for others.

Sejdic and Finci. Arendt and other scholars have also discussed an absence of citizenship as a loss of political voice (Arendt, 1948). Some citizens of Bosnia, such as Roma activist Sejdic and Jewish activist Finci, are not able to run for president. Their political voice is stunted by Bosnia’s bureaucratic violence that excludes individuals who do not fall neatly into Serb, Bosniak and Croat ethnic categories.

Bureaucratic entrapment for Bosnian refugees. Being trapped by bureaucracy is not only a Bosnian phenomenon. In relation to Bosnian refugees in the UK, the asylum bureaucracies were structurally violent. 2,500 refugees were taken in by the UK as part of a quota and were only granted a temporary protection (Kelly, 2004). Although they received the right to have rights, this right had a time limit as a result of the bureaucracy, which added to their insecurity. The British government could renounce the citizenship of the Bosnian exiles as soon as their homeland was considered “safe”. The issue of return for Bosnian refugees was at the forefront of their minds. They were continually waiting and unable to proceed with their daily life, or plan for their unpredictable future. This had negative repercussions on their integration as their interest in language classes and employment prospects waned (2004: 130).
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Turning Two Schools under One Roof into Multi-cultures under One School

Georgia Soares

During the Humanity in Action fellowship program in Sarajevo, there was no shortage of postwar issues to learn and discuss about. Given my particular interest in the field of education, I was struck by the “two-schools-under-one-roof” system currently at play in Bosnia and Herzegovina. First established in 1997, this system segregates students from one given school based on their ethnicity in an effort to implement ethnicity-specific curricula and to minimize interactions among students of different ethnic backgrounds. During our lecture, we also learned from our speaker, Samir Beharic, about how this system is not perceived as discriminatory in BiH because it allows ethnic groups to celebrate and preserve their own history and culture, without one ethnic group’s identity being necessarily favored by another in the classroom. In addition, among many other issues it raises, this system silences Bosnian minorities, constitutionally considered “others,” arguably more so than the political system already does, by having their presence be disregarded in the school’s curricula and structural organization.

In an effort to identify parallels, I reflected on the history of the United States. We, too, had had a history of legal segregation with the “separate but equal” rationale of the Plessy v. Ferguson ruling. But in 1954, at the break of the civil rights movement, the Supreme Court decided in Brown v. Board that segregation between blacks and whites was unconstitutional mainly because it denotes the inferiority of the excluded group and consequently discriminates against it. One might argue that Bosnia’s case is different because the three ethnic groups are given the same amount of power in, say, determining the type of education each of them should receive. They might be separate, but they are equal, one would argue. But in reality, just as the United States needed the Brown v. Board decision to overrule this “separate but equal” mentality in order to combat racism, Bosnia will also need to face the discriminatory consequences of this institutional segregation.

For instance, Croat, Serb and Bosniak children likely have unequal access to school resources, considering that Croat and Serb schools receive additional funding from Croatia and Serbia.

Overall, perhaps the greatest difference that may arise from this separate and unequal philosophy is the polarization of these three groups, and the reinforcement of the idea that they are inherently different from one another and should therefore not mingle, share resources, or equally belong to the same country. As I learned about this issue during lectures and visits to Mostar and other divided towns, I could not stop thinking about the impact this type of segregated education system will have on the future of the Bosnian nation. How can these young Bosnian Croats, Serbs and Bosniaks believe in unity in the future if they will be brought up separated from one another, prohibited from sharing the same history, culture, and even the same space? How will these ethnic differences, which caused the Bosnian War in the 1990s, be solved if children keep on being segregated instead of united?

The bright side is: this problem is not impossible to solve. With enough national and international pressure on politicians and policy-makers, it is impossible to slowly transform Bosnian schools in a more inclusive space for all, much like the US had to create starting in the 1950s. The first step is to create a unified curriculum that is, most of all, objective in its teaching of the subjects, meaning that the disciplines taught should not be slanted towards any preferred viewpoints of any of the ethnic groups. Instead of limiting one’s education to one ethnically skewed perspective, the curriculum should objectively present the many perspectives on various issues. Take a history class, for instance. It would ideally teach the methodology of history and include discussions on the politicization of historical facts so that students can learn to debunk the idea that such a thing as “one truth” exists in history. It would also be crucial to examine case studies from the perspective of the three ethnic groups and beyond, by use of role-play activities and Socratic debate seminars. In this way, students would learn to co-live and mutually understand one another, instead of feeling like they are unable to share the same country.