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From 4 to 15 September 2017, the ZEIT-Stiftung Ebelin und Gerd Bucerius, in collaboration with the Gerda Henkel Stiftung, organized the Summer School “History Takes Place – Dynamics of Urban Change” in Belgrade and Sarajevo. The aim was to study how the past and present interact in public places, art and city structure. Young historians, art historians, specialists in cultural studies and the social sciences, city planners and architects were discovering the capitals of Serbia and Bosnia. The programme examined how distant history, such as the Ottoman and Habsburg period in Sarajevo or the foundation of a national state in Belgrade, and recent history, for example the siege of Sarajevo or the NATO bombing on Belgrade, were and still are processed in questions of art, architecture, city planning, identity, memory and public space.

The event was hosted by the Departments of History of the Faculties of Philosophy at the Universities of Belgrade and Sarajevo. The participants had the opportunity to attend lectures held by professors from the hosting faculties, as well as those by guest speakers. Additionally, all participants prepared a presentation on their own research projects, which were discussed afterwards. This academic engagement was completed by daily visits, guided tours and city explorations.
Monday, 4 September 2017

At the opening event of the Summer School in the Hall of Fame, “Dragoslav Srejović,” at the University of Belgrade, Prof. Dr. Milan Ristović first warmly welcomed all organizers and participants and expressed his pride in hosting researchers from all around the world. A short introduction then detailed the achievements of the previous summer schools on the topic “History Takes Place” by Prof. Dr. Michael Göring (CEO of the ZEIT-Stiftung Ebelin und Gerd Bucerius, Hamburg). Dr. Sybille Wüstemann (Director Communication Department and Event Management, Gerda Henkel Stiftung, Düsseldorf) encouraged all fellows to make use of the opportunities and support offered by the Gerda Henkel Stiftung for young researchers.

Prof. Dr. Marie-Janine Calic (Academic Director of the Summer School and Chair of East and South East European History, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München) presented and explained the summer school program and delivered a short overview of the history of Serbia and Bosnia and Herzegovina. Afterwards, Dr. Anna Hofmann (Programme Director Research and Scholarship, ZEIT-Stiftung Ebelin and Gerd Bucerius, Hamburg) gave some general information and invited the participants to introduce themselves and present their research projects.

After the introduction, the first lecture was held by Prof. Dr. Aleksandar Ignjatović (Department of Architecture, University of Belgrade) on the topic “National Unity, Ethnic Diversity and Cultural Mediation: Architecture and Ideology in Yugoslavia, 1918-1974”. Prof. Ignjatović first stressed that architecture, national unity, ethnic diversity and politics were applicable in both Yugoslavias (1918-1941 and 1945-1990). However, he emphasized that architecture is not merely used as a propaganda tool. Furthermore, we still need to understand why some projects were encouraged, what meaning they had for the identity and how they have been transformed by upcoming ideas and changing ideologies. Prof. Ignjatović divided his lecture into two parts. First, he explained the origins of Yugoslavism. During the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, the idea of the “three-named people” was practiced also in architecture. The idea of unification has found its strongest formation after 1929 when the dictatorship was established. The aim to unify the Yugoslav nation can be seen at the monument to the Unknown Soldier, the Kosovo temple and the Mestrović Bridge. Second, he explained the conception of the architecture in socialist Yugoslavia, which oscillated between cultural, national and regional identity. The state functioned as mediator of sorts between the different cultures and identities. Governmental aims such as progress, freedom and evolution were also represented in architecture. This can be seen in the Belgrade fair or the construction of New Belgrade.
When exploring both examples, it is important to bear in mind the alternating relationship of ideology and architecture in their historical context.

The first day was rounded off by a welcome dinner in the restaurant “Tri Sesira” and a performance by the actress Ljiljana Jakšić.

Tuesday, 5 September 2017

The daily programme started with a presentation by Nataliia Otrishchenko (Center for Urban History of East Central Europe in Lviv, Ukraine). She asked “Where Does History Start?” and showed connections to the past in residential areas developed during late socialism. Her research analysed the Sykhiv district in Lviv, using methods of oral history (interviews with residents), observing everyday life in the area and speaking to architects and urban planners. She demonstrated that although houses and public space were planned and built in a uniform way, people living in this area are using and shaping the space in their own individual way. This is comparable to New Belgrade.

To identify with one’s “own” residential area, it is also necessary to bring history to mass housing. Sykhiv provides the examples of the Cossack heritage, the memorialization of the visit of John Paul II, in 2001, to Lviv, the statues of Mother Mary and the monument to the liquidators of the Chernobyl catastrophe. At the conclusion of her presentation, Nataliia Otrishchenko stressed the great human potential of this residential area. She underlined that the past should be understood as a shared human experience and opportunity for understanding.

Mario Miličević (formerly at the Institute for Urban Planning, Civil Engineering and Ecology (IUGERS) in Banja Luka, Republic of Srpska) then lectured on the “Spatial Evolution of Belgrade and Sarajevo”. He illustrated how the natural and geographic environment shaped the cities of Belgrade and Sarajevo through the centuries and the subsequent advantages and disadvantages for both. Belgrade is geographically more open than Sarajevo, which is captured between the mountains. Furthermore, through the centuries, the Serbian capital was positioned on the border of large empires, and was therefore far more vulnerable to the danger of attacks. At the same time, the Sava and Danube rivers, as trading routes, contribute to the economic development of the town. Sarajevo on the other hand is in the middle of the Ottoman Empire and for a long time had no fear of attack. The city connected the Mediterranean Sea (especially the trading cities Dubrovnik and Kotor) and the Pannonian lowland. Both cities grew during the time of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia (1918-1941) and were later industrialized during Tito’s Yugoslavia. This industrialization led to new housing structures in both cities (New Belgrade and New Sarajevo).

After a short break, Jana Brsakoska (Institute for Strategic Research and Education (ISIE) in Skopje, Macedonia) spoke about “The Relationship between the Built Heritage of Socialist Yugoslavia and the City Development.” Her presentation focused on the built heritage, new typologies of architectural buildings and urban space. She emphasized that the constructed heritage plays an important role in the city morphology and that the conception of the city has changed; urban planners and architects are faced with new situations. Therefore, it is necessary to appeal to all stakeholders (architects, urban planners,
politicians, investors, community etc.) to manage the change of a historic urban landscape and to follow the needs of housing and public space.

During the Real Socialism period in Yugoslavia, new planning ideologies were established. Urban planners and architects spearheaded the planning and building of larger cities such as Belgrade, Sarajevo and Skopje, as well as smaller towns. The goal was to reduce the difference in the whole region and create a heterogeneous society. Belgrade gained a new futuristic shape and, despite the heavy grey concrete constructions, the architects managed to build big domes, such as the Belgrade fair. After the disintegration of Yugoslavia, new stakeholders planned to change the face of cities. Jana Brsakoska presented the example of Skopje, a city that has been reinvented in the “Skopje 2014” project, aiming to rebuild the city centre in what is now known as the “Macedonistic style”. This means rebuilding the heritage from the period of Yugoslavia, as in the Ottoman heritage, by installing a new neo-classical facade over it. With this example, she demonstrated how ideology, history and heritage in the public space can be transferred through architecture.

In the afternoon, Prof. Vladimir Milenković (Department of Architecture, University of Belgrade), conducted a guided tour through the old and New Belgrade. The tour focused on the historic centre and the complex and often contradictory development of the city. By walking through the city, the key geographical, historical and socio-cultural facts were presented. In addition to the Republic Square, Topličin venac, Varoš kapija, Kralja Petra Street, Princess Ljubica’s Residence, Dositej’s Lyceum, the French Embassy in old Belgrade, during the ride to New Belgrade, for example, the sites of staro sajmište, Central Committee of the Communist Party, Residential Blok 61-64 was seen. At the end of the tour, in front of the Genex Towers, the impact of the communist period was discussed, as well as the changes nowadays.

**Wednesday, 6 September 2017**

The third day started with a presentation by **Hilette Lindeque** (Technical University Graz, Austria) on the topic “Housing Structures in a Post-socialist (former) Yugoslavia – Transforming Belgrade”. She explained how Belgrade served as an ideal of Yugoslav architecture. The split with Stalin was seen in architectural spheres by combining socialism and capitalism. So the Yugoslav Forum on Housing and Construction formulated the “right to housing”, which means that housing had to be provided for the working class. State property was to be replaced by social property. However, the rapidly growing population surpassed the building speed of the housing structures. Thus, the right to housing became an economic project. Subsequently, the informal construction spread, especially after the disintegration of Yugoslavia. Staro sajmište (part of New Belgrade with housing structures from even before the Kingdom of Yugoslavia) and Kaluđerica (part of the Zvezdara district in Belgrade, where informal housing grew, especially after the disintegration) served as two examples for informal housing with their own insufficient infrastructure and administration and concurrent growth rates. These examples raised the question of how to define informal housing, and what *informal* means in this context.

**John Mounir Hanna** (Technical University Delft, Netherlands) presented a different view on the relation between housing, public space and urban conflicts. In his lecture, he examined “The Role of the Built Environment in Studying Historical Urban Conflicts,” the destruction of the built environment itself and how it suffers during violent attacks. Violence, in this case, can be understood as a terrorist attack, civil
war, bombing or a siege. This kind of violence always delivers the same result: a destroyed/affected built environment and people who live daily in this area. In an attempt to understand how people could live, even prosper in such circumstances, and how the environment itself changed after the violence, John Mounir Hanna explored the built environment itself. As opposed to old ruins (Roman or Greek antique sites), which are no longer connected to the present, the modern ruins very visibly connect the contemporary past with the present. These modern ruins tell us something about the act of violence that destroyed them and the associations the people have with the history around them.

The next presentation, “The Deliberate Targeting of Cultural Heritage during Armed Conflicts and its Role in Post-Conflict Reconstruction,” held by Noura Alsaleh (Brandenburg University of Technology Cottbus-Senftenberg, Germany) followed the topics of violence and deconstruction. She emphasized the problem of reconstruction after a war. Who decides how something is reconstructed? It is nearly impossible to build up structures that had grown for centuries. Even though UNESCO forbid the destruction of cultural heritage in 1954, the crime is not punished. Wars affect not only people, but also the built cultural heritage, which is targeted with the aim to destroy identity. She gave four examples of this loss of identity: Frauenkriche in Dresden, Stari Most in Mostar, Neumarkt in Dresden and the Souk in Beirut. These well-known sites have been destroyed during wars and subsequently rebuilt in different ways. But the question remains if and how identity can be rebuilt or reconstructed.

After the lunch break, Prof. Dr. Jovo Bakić (Department of Sociology, University of Belgrade) reported on “Belgrade Waterfront: An (Un)Usual Criminal Urban Story at the Periphery of the World Capitalist System”. Prof. Bakić referred to the inconsistency of this large construction project in which a whole new town quarter, including shopping centres and schools, should be built at the Sava river. Projects like this - also called gated communities - can be seen in other parts of the world (Istanbul, Jakarta, Sarajevo etc.), It does not alter the fact that the social structure in this part of the town has already changed. Former poor house owners had to leave the city centre to accommodate the construction site. Additionally, Prof. Bakić stressed that there is much opposition to the investors from Saudi Arabia, because of the lack of guarantees and credits. He is concerned about losing the town’s character, shape, and social structure by building an expensive, large, glassy quarter in which no average earner can afford to live.

Directly after his lecture, the group accompanied Prof. Bakić to the construction site itself. First, the participants had the opportunity to look at the official construction model and to inform themselves about the project from employees with an absolutely different point of view. Then they took a walk to the construction site, and could form their own opinion.

In the evening, the participants joined a one-hour tour through the Museum of Yugoslav History, where the so called yugo-nostalgic view of history still continues. It contains hundreds of official gifts, handmade torches from citizens and birthday gifts to the President Josip Broz Tito, whose whole life is depicted. In a separate part of the museum’s ground, the House of Flowers is located, where the mausoleum of Tito and his wife Jovanka Broz is located.
Thursday, 7 September 2017

The morning started with a lecture by **Prof. Dr. Guido Hausmann** (Head of History Division, Leibniz Institute for East and Southeast European Studies, Regensburg, Germany). He spoke on the topic “Urban Ethics: A Recent Trend in Urban Studies in Historical Perspective?” and introduced the participants to an interdisciplinary research project in which he takes part. They observe urban ethnic opportunities in cities worldwide (Tokyo, Auckland, Moscow, Istanbul, Berlin, Munich etc.). Under the term urban ethnic, among other things, he examines the way in which ethnicization affects the lives of city inhabitants and how actors (citizens, state, political groups, protests etc.) create an urban-ethical space. He presented four observation steps: the first called “social creativity”, determines how social actors develop and claim models of urban living. The second dimension is the moral economy and the question of how claims and references interact with tradition and informal rules. “Governing techniques” represent the third dimension. Finally, the question is asked whether the urban subject has gained new self-confidence, which represents the fourth dimension called “subjects and subjectivation”. At the end of his presentation, Prof. Hausmann focused on the historical perspectives, which means that the cities are following their own logic. For example, the urban-rural contrast is losing importance and cities are losing their distinctiveness (caused also by globally similar-looking construction projects). He appealed to researchers and active urban citizens to raise their voice and to be part of real changes rather than just publishing in academic papers.

After the lecture on urban studies, **Marija Đokić** (Graduate School for East and Southeast European Studies, LMU Munich, Germany) introduced the audience to the theme “national theatre”. In her presentation “French Repertoire, German Education and Slavic Guests: Transnational and Transcultural Processes in the National Theatre in Belgrade”, she depicted the connections between the National Theatre in Belgrade and other theatres in Europe. In the 19th century, Belgrade was situated between the Austro-Hungarian and the Ottoman Empires and was influenced by both. During this time, the National Theatre aimed to create a national identity and unity by playing in the national language with national themes and actors. Even for guest appearances, a special permission was needed if they wanted to play in their own language. Nevertheless, the repertoire from 1880-1914 was highly influenced by France and was modelled on theatres in Munich, Prague, Vienna and Moscow. In addition to these transnational connections, Marija Đokić explained, the most popular plays included musicals and folklore. At the end of the 19th century, the creation of a Yugoslav identity became more important. Thus, the national theatres in Belgrade, Novi Sad, Skopje and Zagreb have been linked with each other and have tried to convey a common identity. At the same time, the National Theatre in Belgrade intended to connect with other European cultural institutions.

In the next presentation, **Darija Davidović** (University of Vienna, Austria) presented “State Commemoration of War vs. Oppositional Artistic Confrontation with War”. In the first part of her presentation, she focused on the official commemoration of the NATO bombing of Yugoslavia. After an introduction about the historical context and consequences of the NATO bombing, such as numbers of casualties, damaged infrastructure, collateral damages etc., she concentrated on the 16th commemoration of the NATO bombing in 2015. She analysed the structure of the ceremony, which was created as a play in five parts with a prologue. In this play, the killing of a soldier, a policeman and a little girl by the bombing was told by Nebojša Kundulic who served as auctorial narrator. Thereafter, Aleksandar Vučić,
President of Serbia, delivered a speech in which he performed as a severe and benignant father figure. He mythologised the history and drew clear lines to the present.
The second part of the presentation showed oppositional artistic confrontation with the recent history and the difficulties that arise from it. The critical artists have to deal with tough conditions such as cancelled performances, less financial support from the state, difficult collaboration with other artists etc. Nevertheless, non-governmental organizations like the “Dah theatre” are trying to cope with the history in another open-minded and artistic way.

Following the presentations on state and artistic war commemoration, Katharina Sebold (University of Bremen, Germany) talked on “Locating War in Cinematic Discourses on Belgrade and Sarajevo”. She discussed how cinema and film can serve as a kind of collective memory. She also explained that consuming, speaking and referring to important films is much more common in Serbian and Bosnian societies than in western countries. In particular, jokes with interethnic connotation are used. This demonstrates how war, on the one hand, can be something daily, something people get used to and, on the other hand, shocking and frightening. Katharina Sebold illustrated, by showing parts of the films, how different the approach is between local and foreign film directors. This can also be said for the reception. It appears that film directors from the region have the right to show specific scenes and to joke on every topic, while films from foreign directors are denigrated as Hollywood movies. She stressed that through films a different way of reflecting one’s own past is possible; in some films, the critical setting is visible only after the second or third watching. Thus, these films mostly have not been forbidden. However, this multilayer structure also makes it very challenging for foreigners to understand the jokes and the underlying content.

After an afternoon filled with information about theatre, art and film, the group joined a short tour through the Yugoslav Film Archives. Marjan Vujović has welcomed the group and gave information about the archive collection. The participants could also try some antique cinematic hardware and trace the technical developments.
Following the tour, the group took a short walk to a cinema belonging to the Yugoslav Film Archives named “Dinko Tucaković” in Kosovska street. The film director Goran Rebić there presented his documentary “The Punishment” (2000). The documentary shows the NATO bombing of Belgrade in 1999. In addition to the physical destruction of buildings and citizens, Goran Rebić caught in an empathic way how the mental destruction during and after the bombing took place. Thereafter, there was enough time for a fruitful discussion with the film director.

Friday, 8 September 2017

The programme started with an impressive lecture presented by Prof. Vladimir Kulić (School of Architecture, Florida Atlantic University, USA) on the topic “Exhibiting Yugoslavia”. He introduced the upcoming exhibition “Toward a Concrete Utopia: Architecture in Yugoslavia, 1948-1980”. Prof. Vladimir Kulić is the curator for the Museum of Modern Art in New York, together with Martino Stierli. The lecture was structured along the four parts of the exhibition. The first part dealt with the monuments in former Yugoslavia. He showed pictures of well-known monuments such as Jasenovac, as well as some that were lost or destroyed during the last war. Explaining how the meaning of the monuments changed through time and how they are nowadays misused as playgrounds, Prof. Kulić also faced the problem of identification with the past.
The second part concentrated on architectural peculiarities in building official infrastructure. Perhaps the most stunning example Prof. Kulić gave was the former children’s hospital in Krvavica (today Croatia), which was built in 1963. The rotund hospital was designed for the needs of children with lung diseases. It demonstrates how advanced the architectural approach of this time was. The third part of the lecture dealt with everydayness. Besides furniture and articles of daily use, the K67 kiosk designed by Saša Mächtig was depicted. This small polyfibre kiosk is based on reinforced modules that can be stuck together in different ways, so that it fits in every location and fulfils different needs. The K67 was common throughout Yugoslavia but just a few survived until today. The last part presented was the topic of identities. This part of the exhibition aims to show how identities, for example the Bosnian identity, changed with the arrival of modernity. All in all, the lecture created anticipation for the MOMA exhibition, for the research of, and search for, lost architectural treasuries.
Sara Lusic-Alavanja (“ARCH+” Journal for Architecture and Urbanism, Berlin, Germany) afterwards presented her research project on “Belgrade New Wave - New Architecture and Painting in Yugoslavia of the 1980s”. She concentrated on individual protagonists of the last generation of artists and architects, who were active before the war in Yugoslavia. These artists were part of the new pop-cultural wave, like the “Transavantgarde” in Italy or the “Neue Wilde” in Germany. She illustrated the location of this scene in Yugoslavia within the international movement at this time. In the 1980s, space became moreover one of the central parts of artistic expression in Belgrade: “New Image” in Yugoslavia meant that exhibitions took place in urban space and in the virtual space of popular television broadcasts. Sara Lusic-Alavanja showed the resulting similarities in the work and the respective approaches of the artists’ group “Alter Imago” and the group of architects “MEČ”. Finally she underlined that the war in Yugoslavia led to a marginalization of the “New Image” movement.

Before the lunch break, Prof. Dr. Marie-Janine Calic took the opportunity to present a short general overview on the Yugoslav history and the disintegration of Yugoslavia. She clearly explained the political, socio-economic, social and ethnic changes in the region during the last 100 years; participants were prepared for the trip to Bosnia and its diverse society and history.

In the afternoon, Prof. Simona Ćupić (History of Modern Art, University of Belgrade) took the group on a guided tour of the topic “Themes and Ideas of Modernity 1900 – 1941: Serbian Culture and Public Space”, through the old part of Belgrade. It started at the Princess Ljubica Residence, moving to the first Serbian primary school “King Petar I”, estimated to be from around 1857, and afterwards over the Kalemegdan complex. Prof. Ćupić referred to the changes in art, architecture and sculpture. In a lively manner, she explained the diverse influences on the Serbian capital from the period of the Ottoman Empire as well as the idea of Yugoslav unity from 1918. In particular the pobjednik (the winner), a sculpture of an uncoated hero at the square on Kalemegdan, illustrates the will to show the world the new unified state Yugoslavia.
Saturday, 9 September 2017

In the morning it was time to leave Belgrade and start a bus trip over Kravice and Srebrenica to Sarajevo. At the first stop in Kravice, Bosnia, the participants were welcomed by two ladies from the local NGO “Maja”. They took the group to a monument for killed soldiers and civilians during the Second World War and the last war during the disintegration of Yugoslavia. They briefly explained the Bosniak attacks on the village Kravice and the difficulties in the period immediately after the war. However, they wanted to emphasize that the war is over and that people need to move on and find new ways of overcoming ethnic borders. They themselves found a way, by founding the women’s cooperative “Maja”, in which they plant and sell local grown fruits and vegetables, and then support other women’s projects without focusing on their ethnic backgrounds.
After the visit to the monument, the group went to the school of Kravice. There, together with another four women from the cooperative, they had prepared a typical rural delicious lunch for the participants. The next stop was made at the Memorial Centre Srebrenica – Potočari, a memorial and cemetery for victims of the 1995 genocide in which around 8,000 Bosnian Muslim men and boys were murdered by Bosnian Serb forces. Upon arrival, the participants had the opportunity to visit the cemetery located next to the Memorial Centre. Afterwards, they listened to the report of a daughter from Srebrenica, whose father and brother were killed in the town. Thereafter, everyone had time to walk about the exhibition situated in the Memorial Centre, and time was allocated for group discussions on the topic. After this touching experience, the journey went on to Sarajevo, where the group arrived in the evening.
The morning started with a three-hour guided tour by Dr. Nicolas Moll, historian and trainer in the field of intercultural cooperation, Sarajevo. The tour covered the topic “Memorial Sites of the Bosnian War”. A bus transported the researchers to the Grdonj hill overlooking the city. From that position, Dr. Moll could describe the war and the siege of Sarajevo. The now separated Bosnian and Serbian parts of the city were clearly visible, as well as the frontier lines of the war, the shooting and bombing spots.

Then the bus took the participants to the other side of the city to the hill where the Jewish cemetery is located. At this site, Dr. Moll introduced some basic historical facts about the Jewish community in Bosnia and especially in Sarajevo. The tour ended at the city centre, where different recently constructed monuments and the controversies around them were explained and discussed.
Monday, 11 September 2017

The second academic part of the summer school started in the morning with a warm welcome by Prof. Husnija Kamberović (Department of History, University of Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina).

Dr. Amir Duranović (Department of History, University of Sarajevo) held the first lecture on “Sarajevo: A Brief History”. He retraced in long lines the complex history of the city, which was founded in 1463 under the Ottoman rule by Isa-Beg Isaković. He delineated the Ottoman and Austro-Hungarian influences and traditions. Furthermore, he explained the significance of the large mosques and religious foundations (Waqf) during the Ottoman rule and their social significance. At the same time, he emphasized that the situation of the town itself, between the hills, with one side open to the field, was not coincidentally chosen. Sarajevo served for centuries as an intersection and a strategic point against the Austro-Hungarians. At the end of the lecture, he noted that the city is clearly divided into a private and public sector, following the apportionment of an Islamic house. The private section is further divided into the different religious groups that lived in the city; in the public section, citizens meet, trade and drink coffee together.

The next presentation by Vincent Thérouin (University of Paris-Sorbonne, France) fitted perfectly into the previous lecture. Under the topic “Archaeological Regard on the Urbanization of Sarajevo during the Ottoman Period (15th-17th centuries)”, he firstly went back to the foundation of Sarajevo under Isa-Beg Isaković. On a chart, he impressively depicted how the city grew during the first decades by showing step by step every new mosque and waqf (charitable endowment under Islamic law) and how they were connected. It is not surprising that analogies to mosques from Istanbul could be found, and it is logical that there is an interest from Turkish Universities to explore these old mosques in the city centre of Sarajevo. Thus, an important number of archaeological excavations have been funded by Turkey. In the second part of his presentation, Vincent Thérouin showed how the concept of mosque and waqf spread in Bosnia, for example to Banja Luka or Travnik, and that the waqf also functioned there as important institutions for the society.

After the lunch break, the next lecture was held by Amila Kasumović (Department of History, University of Sarajevo) on the topic “Physiognomy and Identity of a City: The Case of Sarajevo City Hall”. She explained how the changes in the city built identity during the Habsburg administration, which partly ignored the Ottoman heritage. After a large fire in 1878, it was possible to put up new imperial buildings in Sarajevo. One of the most prominent examples is the City Hall of Sarajevo, which became a symbol for the town.
The architecture of the hall combines different traditions and cultures, and stood for both: ours and theirs, own and foreign. Amila Kasumović pointed out that the construction of the City Hall could represent the aim of the Habsburg administration to unify the Bosnian people by showing that everyone can identify with the architectural design. But this hope was destroyed quickly, because of the rapidly growing national movements. After 1974, the City Hall was used as the National Library. A major crime on the architectural identity of the city took place in August 1992, when the National Library was bombed and caught fire, destroying 70 % of the books. The former City Hall was again reconstructed and re-opened in 2014.

During the early afternoon, two short, guided tours took place through the Sarajevo Museum and the Museum Brusa Bezistan. At the Sarajevo Museum, the history of the assassination of Franz Ferdinand and his wife, which happened on the 28 June 1914, right at the corner of the Museum, could be followed.
In the Museum Brusa Bezistan, the whole history of Bosnia and Herzegovina is exhibited, starting with the first settlements, over the Middle Ages and the heretic church of Bosnia, to the important silver mines in the eastern part of the country. But it also depicts the rural lives of the farmers and the different traditions in the region. The exhibition ended with the history of the last war and war crimes that have taken place at that time.

Tuesday, 12 September 2017

The day was dedicated to the religious diversity of the city. Dr. Eli Tauber (University of Sarajevo) started with a lecture on the “Jewish Sarajevo”. He retraced the triangle Dubrovnik-Sarajevo-Split and explained the trade and marriage connexions existing already shortly after the foundation of these cities. From this triangle, the Jewish community spread in smaller towns like Banja Luka, Bihač, Bijeljina or Mostar. At the beginning of the 20th century, Sarajevo replaced Thessaloniki as the most important Jewish centre. It is estimated that 12,500 Jews were living in Sarajevo before World War II. During the Second World War, most Jews fled, hiding their Jewish identity under Muslim names. Those who remained in the city were killed. During the last war in Bosnia, the Jewish community fled and mostly went to Jerusalem. Today, the Jewish community consists of about 500 members and they are well integrated into the city. There is no open anti-Semitism and no need for police to protect Jewish facilities.
Following this brief introduction into the history of the Jewish Community of Sarajevo, the group went on a guided tour by the Association Haggadah through the Jewish Sarajevo. The tour started at the Jewish Museum in the middle of Baščaršija, where not only the history of the Jews from Sarajevo is exhibited but also issues of Jewish tradition and religion.

The next stop was on the other side of the river, where the parish hall and the synagogue are located. In this stunning surrounding, the guide explained the varied history of the building and its usage today. The tour ended at the Association Haggadah’s building, where the aims of the Association were discussed.

In the afternoon, Franziska Singer (Philipps-University Marburg, Germany) presented her research on “Sarajevo as a Muslim, Multi-Religious and European City”. For her research, Ms Singer interviewed several women from Sarajevo, aged from 20 to 35 years, and asked them the question whether they positioned themselves more as European or Muslim. Ms Singer got the impression that the women talk much of moral and religious issues, and that in this context European values (for example individuality, rules, and laws) are viewed negatively. The religion itself is not politicised, but the difference between practising and non-practicing Muslims is discussed within the community. During and shortly after the recent war, a turn toward radicalisation could be seen. One woman explained that, for her, Sarajevo is of course situated within Europe, a perspective sometimes not understandable for Muslims from Saudi
Arabia. At the same time, women wear the scarf and thus represent Islam in the public sphere. And in that public sphere, it is unlikely that women will smoke, drink, kiss, or eat ice-cream from a cone.

**Yulia Oreshina** (Marie Curie-Sklodowska University, Lublin, Poland) reported on the “Difficult Past: Jewish Memory in Cities of South-Eastern Europe”. Ms Oreshina focused on the Holocaust Memory as a global concept. In this context, the way of memorialisation is slightly influenced by the Holocaust Museum from the United States and the Jewish diaspora living there. She recognised the problem, that in the public space of former Yugoslavia, Jewish victims are depicted as other citizens of Yugoslavia. There is no separate place or monument for just the Jewish victims. This somehow neglects the fact that before and after the Second World War the Jewish community played an important role in Yugoslavia in its entirety and not just in Sarajevo. And at the same time, it denies responsibility for the crimes. This tendency, Ms Oreshina explained, is rooted in the socialist memory culture.

The last presentation was held by **Simon Niklas Willem Krauß** (Eberhard Karls University Tübingen, Germany) on the topic “Who Changes Whom? Relations between Changes in the City of Sarajevo and Changes in its Jewish Community from late Ottoman Times to the End of Austro-Hungarian Rule”, which appropriately summarised the inter-religious day. By analysing two major newspapers from the Bosnian *vilayet* of the late Ottoman Times, Mr Krauß illustrated the opportunities that religious communities gained by the End of the 19th century. For example, in 1856, equal rights were proclaimed for all citizens, regardless of their religion. Furthermore, in 1873, a Jew became director of the newspaper *Bosna*. But the participation of the minorities expanded further; a couple of years later, Jews become part of the Ottoman parliament, and thus their political influence increased. The fact that Jews also played a role in the resistance against the Austro-Hungarian Empire indicates that they were an integrated part of the Ottoman society.

**Wednesday, 13 September 2017**

In the morning, **Dr. Vera Katz** (Department of History, University of Sarajevo) lectured on the topic “Ideological Use of the Memorial Plaques Dedicated to Gavrilo Princip”. Dr. Katz showed the frequent changing layers of memorialisation of Gavrilo Princip during the last 100 years. Shortly after the First World War, everything that remembered the Austro-Hungarian Period was demolished. In 1930, the first memorial plaque dedicated to Gavrilo Princip was erected. But already in April 1941, the Ustaša regime that was occupying Bosnia pulled the plaque off and gave it to Adolf Hitler as a birthday gift – a sign that Bosnia was being cleansed. After the Second World War, a new plaque was installed, and Princip was celebrated as a national hero who fought for all Yugoslav people. In 1953 the museum *Mlada Bosna* (Young Bosnia) was opened as a tribute to the life of Princip. During the recent war, both the museum and the plaque were destroyed. Dr Katz encounters this time as a change in perception of Gavrilo Princip; he became a Serbain, in the public’s opinion. In 2007, the museum was reopened under the name Sarajevo Museum and a new plaque was positioned. This shows how memorialisation quickly changes and that it depends on state interpretation.
The day continued with a round table discussion on the topic “Civil Society and Urban Development of the Foundation” with Boriša Mraović, Association for Culture and Art CRVENA and Aida Vežić, Regional Museum Coordinator, Deputy Head of BiH Office, Foundation Cultural Heritage without Borders. Ms Vežić explained the efforts of the foundation not just to protect and reconstruct built heritage, but also traditional building skill and knowledge. She also emphasized that cultural heritage is an active force in reconciliation, peace building, and social and economic development; it is a human right. The Association for Culture and Art CRVENA deals with cultural heritage in a different way. As Mr Mraović explained, the association is trying to connect art and culture and to canalize its potential in changing society. Therefore, they cooperate with the local community so they can recognize urgent problems and help solve them, for example water supply. Both ways grabbed the attention of the audience and were enthusiastically discussed.

The day ended with a fruitful discussion session with Adelheid Wölfl, Correspondent South Eastern Europe Der Standard, Vienna, Austria, on the topic “Western Balkans Today – Current Challenges for Politics and Society.” Ms Wölfl gave an overview of the complete region, not just Bosnia. She named the problems in Kosovo subsequent to separation, which since 2014 are predominantly the changeless situation of the disintegrated Roma in the region, the unsolved Albanian question in Macedonia, the lack of will and ideas for reforms of the Bosnian constitution and the corruption in the Western Balkans. Ms Wölfl sees a possibility for change if the economy is stimulated, the educational system reformed and international credits loaned. During the discussion, the question of the state-influenced media was discussed, as well as the impact of different Muslim states.

Thursday, 14 September 2017

Dr. Sanja Zadro (University of Zagreb, Croatia) started on Thursday morning with her presentation on “Vitality of Disaster and Reinventions of the Ruin: Historic Preservation (of the Built Environment) in Bosnia and Herzegovina Today”. Dr. Zadro firstly named some of just a few books published at the beginning of the 20th century on architecture in Bosnia and Herzegovina, namely Naši gradovi (our towns) published by Ćiro Truhelka in 1904 and Naše starine (our old heritage) by Džemal Čelić from 1953. Questions concerning architecture and heritage in Bosnia became internationally popular during and after the last war. Pictures, such as the bombing of the stari most (old bridge) in Mostar, were seen in news all around the world. Due to the funding of the international community, the old bridge, as a symbol of unity between the different ethnicities, was quickly reconstructed, as well as the old part of the town next to the bridge. Dr. Zadro indicated that, besides the bridge, Mostar has much more important architectural and cultural heritage. For example, the built heritage from the Austro-Hungarian period is mostly not protected. Organisations such as CIDOM are trying to document the changes in the city’s architecture. An example of how incorrect handling of cultural heritage can look was also given by Dr. Zadro. She presented the Partisan Memorial Cemetery in Mostar, a unique architectural monument designed by architect Bogdan Bogdanović, which started to disintegrate after the war. In 2006, thanks to the efforts of several NGOs and architects, the monument was proclaimed a national monument of Bosnia and Herzegovina. However, due to financial reasons and a lack of knowledge or sense for architecture, culture and heritage, the monument is again decaying.

The next presentation also addressed the topic of reconstruction but in the historical long-term. Katelyn Williams (Brandenburg University of Technology Cottbus-Senftenberg, Germany) talked on
“(Re)Emerging from the Ashes of War: Heritage Recovery in Sarajevo’s Baščaršija District”. During the centuries, the Baščaršija District was often destroyed, burned or damaged. The first time the town went up in flame was in 1697 due to an attack by Eugene of Savoy, but shortly afterwards, the city was built up again. From 1878 until 1918, Sarajevo gained its Austro-Hungarian architectural style, easy to recognize in the former Franz-Joseph-Straße and the City Hall. The next larger destructions happened during the Second World War, which mostly affected Jewish institutions. Under the legacy of Tito, the Baščaršija District deteriorated increasingly; over 200 shops were damaged. But in 1975, a regulatory plan for reconstruction of the district emerged. The reconstruction started under modern international standards and, as an orientation point, the year 1878 was chosen so that everything younger than that was not protected. Old original material was used to reconstruct the front; the inside was created with new modern materials. Thus, at the beginning of 1980, the rehabilitation of the Baščaršija District took place and about 350 shops were reconstructed. Unfortunately, this part of the town was also bombed during the war from 1992 – 1995, and most of the reconstructed buildings were affected again. The youngest post-war recovery is not satisfactory. Due to the lack of funds many owners reconstruct illegally and in their own way. Rich investors, mostly from Saudi Arabia, are financing the recovery of religious institutions, but they also follow their own interests and do not observe the international standards in reconstructing.

Dr. Hanna Baumann (Kings College, Cambridge, United Kingdom) introduced in her presentation, “Violence in and through Urban Space: Non-Humans as Actors and Victims?”, the typology of violence through space. As a basis, the wider definitions of violence of Johan Galtung, Nancy Scheper-Hughes and Philippe Bourgois were explored. Following Galtung, violence is divided into three categories: physical, symbolic and structural. This division is again graded into negative and positive. Dr. Baumann however does not use these categories to describe violence on people, but rather on urban structure, housing and built environment. Through that, a hierarchy of violence on non-human actors can be recognized. Dr. Baumann named some examples for the different kinds of violence. Under the physical category, for example, urbicide (as a way of suicide of built environment), or home demolitions (state structures command destruction of housing), were subsumed. Destruction of cultural heritage (for example the bombing of the national library in Sarajevo) and cultural genocide (the aim to demolish everything that defines the culture of the enemy) was classified as symbolic violence. The last category “structural violence” can be recognized for instance in infrastructural exclusion (like in Gaza). At the end, some questions remained unanswered: Who has the right to the place? What role are minorities playing? And who is responsible and to be penalized for violence: the soldier who is acting out of conscientiousness, the state, the enemy?

After three days full of information about mosques, waqfs, residential building, the old town Baščaršija, the City Hall etc., it was time to go for a guided walk through the city, so that many presented places could be discussed in front of the buildings themselves.

The evening was graded up by a meeting with Author Dževad Karahasan moderated by Adisa Bašić, Poet and Journalist at the Hotel Europa in Sarajevo. Dževad Karahasan, one of the most famous authors from Bosnia, read out of two of his books, “Exodus from a City” and “Letters”. After the reading, the participants had the opportunity to discuss some perceptions of the author regarding housing structures and why he is so focused on old parts of Sarajevo to the exclusion of New Sarajevo. His view on women and their role in the society raised many questions and discussions with the audience. During the dinner, Mr Karahasan kindly surrendered himself for another few hours to the cross-examination, which was full of laughs, jokes, philosophy and practical advice.
The last day of the summer school started with a presentation by Anna Dimitrova Kokalanova (Hafencity University Hamburg, Germany) on the topic “The Roma Mahala and the City: Reading the City through its Invisible Structures”. Ms Kokalanova analysed the Roma housing structures, called *fakulteta*, in Sofia, Bulgaria. During her research there, Ms Kokalanova tried to understand the inner structure of the quarter, the feelings of the inhabitants and their relationship to the other parts of the town. The Bulgarian society looks at the Roma as exotic people that are not equal to Bulgarians. Thus, the Roma people are isolated from the community of Sofia, but of course they need a space to live. They created this space on the border of the town, and created it their own way, with their own structures. As a consequence several problems with transportation infrastructure, schools, waste management, water and electric power supply emerged. People living in this isolated part of the town call their quarter *mahala* (an Ottoman word for a separate private housing structure) and they feel both secure and isolated at the same time.

Juliane Rahn (Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München, Germany) followed a different perspective on the city structures of Sarajevo. In her presentation “Dogs are More Important than Politics”, she combined animal studies, human-animal studies and critical-animal studies, aiming to depict Sarajevo as a zoo-city, in which different species gather, encounter and interact with each other. She tried to understand the interactions and relations between humans and animals. For her, the grey zones are a particular point of interest, for example, street dogs and the legislation formulated for them. She stressed that urban animals contribute to the dynamics of change. At the end of her presentation, Ms Rahn appealed to rethink the political status of urban animals as inhabitants with the right to have rights.

Dr. Jasmina Gavrankapetanović-Redžić (University of Sarajevo) ended the series of lectures with her presentation “Culture, Memory and Collective Identities in the (Re)Making – The Case of the National Museum of Bosnia-Herzegovina.” First, Dr. Gavrankapetanović-Redžić referred to the time directly after the war, when the National Museum was closed due to lack of financial resources. After the collapse of the socialist system, many cultural institutions were privatised, even though the question still is how something such as national culture can be privatised at all. Then she explained that competing memories and social groups tried to influence the museum’s character, and again ethnic division and the still-open wounds of war came to the surface. The different groups tried to use the museum to redefine cultural heritage and use them for their idea of nation building. She concluded that, in the case of Bosnia and especially the National Museum, dynamic reconfiguration of social classes in a transitional context (from state-socialism to neo-liberal capitalism) and nascent national self-awareness (state-building) coupled with competing forms of collective memory played a major role. It seems that the example of the National Museum could easily stand for the whole country.

The summer school “History Takes Place” ended in a relaxed atmosphere during a farewell dinner with good food, fine interlocutors, serious and non-serious discussions and the promise to return to the multifaceted Balkans.