

**XI International Workshop  
2017**

**Museum Professionals in  
Dialogue: “Challenges of  
Permanent Exhibitions”**

**Sladjana Bojković  
Katarina Mitrović  
Dragana Vidović  
Tea Perinčić  
Nataša Jagdhuhn  
Olga Manojlović Pintar  
Katarina Živanović  
Veselinka Kastratović Ristić**

**Marija Vasiljević  
Jovana Nedeljković  
Lidija Milašinić  
Ana Sladojević  
Emilia Epštajn  
Duško Grbović**





ИСТОРИЈСКИ МУЗЕЈ СРБИЈЕ

**МУЗЕЈ**  
**ЈУГОСЛАВИЈЕ**

**Olga Manojlović Pintar**  
**Institute for Recent History of Serbia**

## **“Dark Tourism” and Renewing Permanent Exhibitions in Former Concentration Camp Museums**

### **Instead of an Introduction**

In 2016, film director Sergei Loznitsa made a documentary on the peculiar contemporary phenomenon of “dark tourism”, and named it *Austerlitz*. The title did not refer to the famous “Battle of The Three Emperors” in the Napoleonic Wars, or offer a clear association with the Auschwitz camp (although one can trace veiled meanings and notions reminiscent of both terms throughout the film). As Loznitsa explained, it was taken from W. G. Sebald’s fourth and (unexpectedly) last novel, bearing the same name and published fifteen years earlier.<sup>1</sup>

The novel’s title character, Jacques Austerlitz, was described as a middle-aged historian of architecture, puzzled and fascinated by lavishly planned railroad stations. This multilayered and profound novel was structured around an accidental event that revived memories suppressed in Austerlitz’s mind for half a century, and

---

<sup>1</sup> For many critics, the book published in February 2001 represented the pinnacle of Sebald’s work and final proof that the humble German professor living and working reticently in the English countryside for decades, is one of the most intriguing of contemporary writers and a most serious candidate for the Nobel Prize for Literature. The haunting past and eternal burden of the Second World War represented the core of his work, described as “the very end of the oneiric history of sadness and futility”. However, in December 2001, sudden news shocked the public. W.G. Sebald died unexpectedly while driving his car. Compared with Primo Levi and Thomas Bernhard, he was perceived “more like a new kind of historian than a new kind of novelist”. Mark O’Connell, “Why You Should Read W. G.”, *The New Yorker*, December 14, 2011. <https://www.newyorker.com/books/page-turner/why-you-should-read-w-g-sebald>

consequently revealed his real identity. The moment in which Austerlitz fortuitously stepped into the Ladies Waiting Room of Liverpool Street Station was the turning point that enabled him to visualize a small Jewish boy sitting in that same space after being brought to London from Prague in one of the 1939 Kindertransports.

Determined to continue his search for truth and to discover the fate of his parents, Austerlitz took several (seemingly self-destructive) voyages. On one of them – the journey to Prague and Theresienstadt – he became overwhelmed by a peculiar emotion that further induced his specific mental state. While wondering through the corridors, halls and yards of the former Jewish ghetto and concentration camp, the past and present overlapped in his mind, as well as reality and dreams, memories and fiction, and he started to feel the presence of the people detained there during the Second World War. “It suddenly seemed to me, with the greatest clarity, that they had never been taken away after all, but were still living crammed into those buildings and basements and attics, as if they were incessantly going up and down the stairs, looking out of the windows, moving in vast numbers through the streets and alleys, and even, a silent assembly, filling the entire space occupied by the air, hatched with gray as it was by the fine rain.”<sup>2</sup>

Sergei Loznitsa placed his camera in the memorial museums of the former concentration camps Dachau and Sachsenhausen and filmed hundreds and thousands of their daily visitors “going up and down the stairs, looking out of the windows, moving in vast numbers through the streets and alleys”. He recorded and edited a black and white film with unusually long-lasting frames, without any comments. The spectators could only hear the sound of footsteps on the pebbles, distant rumours, squeaking doors and (from time to time) the voices of tour-guides explaining the functioning of the camps. On a hot summer day, Loznitsa shot men and women casually dressed in short pants, stretched T-shirts and flip-flops while they observed the original objects, read inscriptions, rested, enjoyed a sandwich break, or took photos and selfies. They performed the same activities tourists usually do in other museums, landscapes of unique natural beauty, natural wilderness,

---

<sup>2</sup> W.G. Sebald, *Austerlitz*, Modern Library Trade Paperback Edition, 2011. iBooks.

picturesque villages, or modern cities. Stunned by this phenomenon, but without any intention of judging or ironising, Loznitsa raised some basic questions: Why are people visiting former camps in such large numbers? Why are they entering the crematoria and gas chambers and taking hundreds of photos in front of the sign “Arbeit macht frei”? Are they determined to improve their knowledge of the Second World War, to face the past and realize the scope of the Nazi crimes, or are they trying to overcome the fear of death in places of mass killings? He didn't offer answers, but further induced viewers to search for them and to ask new questions.



For the readers of Sebald's novel it seemed as if Loznitsa was wondering whether he could capture the mute witnesses from the past whose presence Austerlitz felt in Theresienstadt, to recognize them while silently monitoring the crowd and walking side by side with the visitors through once functional parts of the death factories.



It is rare that a novel and a film inspired by a novel are so perfectly intertwined, and proving authentic and evocative on so many levels, as is the case with Sebald's novel and Loznitsa's film. They both deal with the ambiguous topics of living history, collective responsibility and the individual search for truth. Sebald followed Benjamin in his analysis of modernity. Inside the framework of the imperial legacy he implicitly and subtly connected the dazzling rise of Europe as a cradle of human emancipation, with its consequent fall into the barbarity of Fascism. He placed the magnificent, enchanting edifices built on colonial wealth next to the death camps, gas chambers and crematoria. Loznitsa, on the other hand, has further questioned the space, time and memory relationship. His approach to "dark tourism" and the new forms and contents of museumisation has relied on Primo Levi's statement that not even those who survived the camps could be considered witnesses of the Holocaust/Shoah.<sup>3</sup> How then can people of the third, fourth or fifth generations after the Holocaust/Shoah deal with this trauma?

In this text, I am analysing the transformation of the places of the former concentration camps into archeological sites, and the process of renewing the permanent exhibitions in their museums. In the closing part, I inform the reader on the current project of the successor states of Yugoslavia, "Renewing the 'Ex-Yugoslav' Permanent Exhibition in Block 17 of the Auschwitz-Birkenau State Museum".

---

<sup>3</sup> "We who survived the Camps are not true witnesses. This is an uncomfortable notion which I have gradually come to accept by reading what other survivors have written, including myself, when I re-read my writings after a lapse of years. We, the survivors, are not only a tiny but also an anomalous minority. We are those who, through prevarication, skill or luck, never touched bottom. Those who have, and who have seen the face of the Gorgon, did not return, or returned wordless." Levi, Primo. *The Drowned and the Saved*. Trans. Raymond Rosenthal. New York: Vintage International, 1988.



1. Traditionally perceived as “the guardians of the truth” concerning “national greatness”, museums played a crucial role in the creation of romanticized narratives about the so-called glorious heroic and martyr past. The “patriotic religion” of modern states perceived national history museums as secular temples in which the sharp distinction between “us” and “them” was firmly established. Precisely this binary division was meant to educate by celebrating the “self” and simultaneously shaming the “other”.<sup>4</sup> The exhibiting practices demonized, ridiculed, or criminalized the role of the “inner” or “external” enemy in the national history. The impression of national superiority, and its longevity and continuity deeply rooted in history, were created through the museums’ permanent exhibitions and their suggestive meanings.<sup>5</sup> From the period of early childhood, repeated visits to the museum were not only for improving one’s knowledge of the past as officially envisaged and interpreted, but also for firming up one’s self-esteem and sense of personal security within the larger (national) group.<sup>6</sup>

At the end of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, however, existing historical narratives were challenged, and decades-long official interpretations were

---

<sup>4</sup> Orhan Pamuk, as an observer of the Western world in his *Museum of Innocence*, wrote that: “Visiting the museum for the citizens of the West, during the school years and later as parents eager to show the wonders of the world and its beauty to their children, became part of the life cycle and an element of individual and collective improvement.” However, he pointed to the museum as the institution producing the comfortable feeling of pride and an endless source of the self-security while excluding and shaming “the other”. Orhan Pamuk, *The Museum of Innocence*, Faber&Faber, London 2010.

<sup>5</sup> The concept of a monolith society endangered by foreign and domestic enemies through the history, was skillfully developed in the permanent museum exhibitions of the Nazi and Fascist regimes. “The masses could be tamed and educated in a museum space, which trapped and spoke directly to the viewers in personal terms.” Sandra Esslinger, in: Donald Preziosi and Claire Farago, eds. *Gasping the World: The Idea of the Museum*, Ashgate Publishing Ltd, Burlington 2004.

<sup>6</sup> In Salinger’s *The Catcher in the Rye*, Holden Caulfield describes his early visits to the American Museum of Natural History in New York and its ecclesiastical atmosphere: “I loved that damn museum,” says Holden. “It was a long, long room, and you were only supposed to whisper. (...) The floor was all stone, and if you had some marbles in your hand and you dropped them, they bounced like madmen all over the floor and made a helluva racket, and the teacher would hold up the class and go back and see what the hell was going on.” He continues: “The best thing, though, in that museum was that everything always stayed right where it was. Nobody’d move. You could go there a hundred thousand times, (...) Nobody’d be different. The only thing that would be different would be you.” J. D. Salinger, *The Catcher in the Rye*, Little, Brown and Company, Boston 1951.

relativized. The demands for multi-perspective as opposed to monolithic historical narratives introduced the new paradigm of the museum-forum, which was perceived as a space for a dialogue that didn't exclude disagreements over the various interpretations of the past. The museum was considered to be a field with the potential to transfer social antagonisms into the realm of agonism.<sup>7</sup> The aim was to include political opponents in the dialogue, in order to avoid a devastating social antagonization. Instead of the exclusion of the "other", social inclusion through a debate was affirmed and promoted. However, the planned dialogue often ended in the promotion of totalitarian theories, and the criminalization and trivialization of socialist discourse, which led numerous attempts to establish a critical museum to failure.<sup>8</sup>

Ever since the fall of the Berlin Wall, the horizon of expectations has radically changed. Once "the end of history" was proclaimed, revolutionary visions were perceived only as utopias and revolutionary practices identified only with terror. Humanity seemed to be trapped in the present and compelled to search for its new perspectives in the past instead of in the future. It had entered the age of commemorations, and the past, whether it was considered golden, dark, glorious or martyr, became the repository of the arguments constantly needed in never-ending political disputes. "Facing the past", treating its "scars" and "bleeding wounds", are expressions that have marked the prominent concepts and ideals of the last two decades. History applied and exhibited in the public space, living memories and reenactments of historical events have been constantly raising the public interest in the past. The preserved, or reconstructed historical sites, particularly those created at the places of killings and deaths, became the final destinations of contemporary "pilgrimages". The obsessive wish of millions of men and women to visit the museums and memorial sites created in the former concentration and death camps, reflected the need of individuals, various social groups and the wider societies in

---

<sup>7</sup> See: Chantal Mouffe, *Agonistics: Thinking The World Politically*. London – New York: Verso, 2013.

<sup>8</sup> Katarzyna Murawska-Muthesius, Piotr Piotrowski, *From Museum Critique to the Critical Museum*. Routledge 2015.

general, to face Nazism and anti-Semitism as the deepest downfall of humanity. The majority of those who were participants in the “dark”, “black”, or “grief” tours were determined to recognize and, thus, to fight the revival of fascism and to suppress its legacy.

The museums that were established at the former concentration and death camps, have gained one of the central positions in the post-socialist European historical discourse. Remembering those who were killed or died in the camps, and reviving, reconstructing these experiences from the pieces, and preserving the memory of those who survived, has crucially defined present-day collective identities. Nevertheless, one cannot neglect the fact that the heightened interest in the heavy burden of the Second World War that produced the new branches of tourism, came out of consumeristic curiosity as well.

2. The space of the concentration camps has been transformed into the archaeological sites that have conserved, or partially reconstructed the authentic remnants of the camp barracks, gas chambers and crematoria, so as to create a clear impression of their former look. The intention has been to preserve the camp remains for the future generations, as permanent warning and proof that, in the 20<sup>th</sup> century, millions of people were killed in gas chambers, or driven to death by exhaustion. The ruins were restored and, together with their surroundings, established the *mise-en-scène* ready to stage and to face the past, and simultaneously to warn against hidden or openly expressed manifestations of fascism in the present. The visitors to the sites become not only observers, but also actors, politically and socially engaged and emotional challenged. Whether the reconstructions took part at devastated, partly destroyed, or preserved sites, those areas were treated as authentic and unique. Not only for the descendants of the men and women who perished in the camps, but for all who have entered into the memorial sites, they have represented an area of sanctity – a space literally marked with human ashes, unmarked graves and public execution sites.



The walks through the former camps have represented a specific form of pilgrimage that reaches its climax in front of the gas chambers. It is precisely this cathartic function of the walk which the museums have presented as the reference point of every visit. The men and women are given the possibility of deciding whether they are prepared for the walks through the camp surroundings at the beginning of their visit, and whether they will summarize the impressions and the emotions of their tour in the museum. The museums inside the memorial sites contain the main information and sketch the context of the Second World War and the Nazi ideology; however, their main focus is on the victims of the camps, especially those who didn't survive. After the deconstruction of the socialist regimes, the permanent exhibitions that existed for decades have been or are in the process of being renewed, in accordance with the changed political realities. Their official interpretations of the war, in which the narrative of the anti-fascist struggle had the central position, were abandoned and the Holocaust/Shoah was distinguished as being a unique phenomenon not only in the Second World War, but in the entire history of humanity.



Remembering the victims of Holocaust/Shoah and marking the ideology that formulated and carried it became the essence of the new historical culture. The Holocaust/Shoah museums, together with the various types of museums of Socialism, became the central institutions that defined and constructed the new European identity. Thematically and conceptually, they closely intertwined, further strengthening the increased public interest in the past. Personalizing the victims, individualizing the perpetrators and their collaborators, questioning the neutral role of the bystanders, and recognizing the ideology of Nazism and Fascism that prepared and committed the Holocaust/Shoah, genocides and numerous violations of the warfare – all these elements became the foundations for the historical discourse of contemporary Europe.

However, defining the spaces of the former concentration and death camps as “memory sites” widened the thematic focus of their permanent museum exhibitions. Besides the camps’ history before and during the Second World War, the history of the space that the camps occupied included the postwar period as well. Not only was the ideology which produced the camps museumised, but also the ideology marking the period when some of them had been used as detention camps and prisons for former Nazis and their collaborators. The idea of presenting the afterlives of the camps was an attempt to produce a

more nuanced insight into the history. However, this kind of sensibilisation of the public contained certain dubious meanings. In an attempt to provide a precise history of the site, this practice evened out the two dictatorial regimes and contributed towards further equalizations of the two ideologies – Nazism and Socialism. (Un)intentionally, it risked victimising the perpetrators. The concept of shared victimhood and the universality of human suffering was recognized and introduced as an important part of so-called museum diplomacy in the post-Cold War world.

Finally, besides the two changes mentioned – the introduction of the victim as the central focus of interest, and the inclusion of the post-war history of the camps – , the re-conceptualized museum exhibitions included in their new narratives the concise histories of the process of museumisation as well. This intervention presented the specific outlook of the Cold War and the analysis of the memory culture during the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Thus, the visitors were given the possibility to rethink not only the Holocaust/Shoah, but the ways the memory of it had developed through time.

3. Besides the thematic transformation, the museums of the former concentration and death camps have been forced to search for new organizational and financial practices too. On the one hand, they are faced with the growing number of visitors and the need to provide adequate information, to maintain the exhibitions and to preserve the authenticity of the objects and sites. On the other, the neoliberal pragmatism based on private property, and the withdrawal of the state support from many areas of social provisions, is creating a sense of constant uncertainty for these institutions.

Today, the questions of museum transformation discussed on various levels and from various perspectives where the art museums are concerned, have become crucial for historical museums too. “The cultural logic of the late capitalist museum” shook up the traditional and imposed new principles of functioning.<sup>9</sup> History museums that were considered as encyclopaedic institutions, faced the possibility of being transformed into corporate entities. In a world based on the

---

<sup>9</sup> Rosalind Krauss, “The Cultural Logic of the Late Capitalist Museum”, in: *October*, Vol. 54 (Autumn, 1990), pp. 3-17.

phrase, “History sells”, the “museum industry” was expected to be an important contributor to the wider economy. Their commercialization and the constantly increasing number of visitors challenged the traditional forms of organization and financing. In that respect, the institution of “the foundation” was introduced, with the intention to facilitate long-term preservation programmes that could enable the further functioning and preservation of the museums.

Whether museums at the sites of the former camps were established shortly after the Second World War and existed for decades, or created as completely new institutions, the historical museums galvanized the political discourse. On the one hand, they crucially redefined the historical culture by focusing on the specific thematic contents, and on the other, they became the dam possessing the strength to block the rising tide of the “historical culture industry”, which threatened to endanger the emancipatory function of the museums.<sup>10</sup>

Linking “museology, history, theory, and criticism to contemporary social conditions” has appeared as “an urgent and painfully obvious issue” (229)<sup>11</sup>. However, the “notion of a museum as a corporate entity with a highly marketable inventory and the desire for growth” complicates this noble and idealistic mission and goal. In such a position, museums are forced to meet the needs of visitors and to maximize profits. They become part of the consumeristic society framework and one of its important grounding points.

The mass consumerism of historical culture became part of contemporary societies. The questions that Loznitsa raised while watching the people entering the former camps have one more answer. “The consumer is not king, as the culture industry would like to have us

---

<sup>10</sup> When in 1944 the phenomenon of the “culture industry” was recognized, Adorno and Horkheimer concluded that instead of emancipating and enlightening, capitalism created a culture industry that has been producing goods for a market-oriented economy, and consequently creating the docile individuals as parts of the obedient masses. Adorno, Horkheimer, “The Culture Industry, Enlightenment as Mass Deception”, in: *Dialectics of Enlightenment* 93 – 136.  
[https://web.stanford.edu/dept/DLCL/files/pdf/adorno\\_culture\\_industry.pdf](https://web.stanford.edu/dept/DLCL/files/pdf/adorno_culture_industry.pdf)

<sup>11</sup> Donald Preziosi and Claire Farago, eds. *Grasping the World: The Idea of the Museum*, Ashgate Pub Ltd, Burlington 2004.

believe, not its subject, but its object (...) The masses are not the measure but the ideology of the culture industry...".<sup>12</sup>



The question of the funding and functioning of the historical sites of the former camps and their museum institutions, appears to be as important as the question of their thematic scope and interest. Although the central facts point to the justice of assuming a collective responsibility towards the war victims, these institutions are threatened by the continuous state withdrawal of financial support. Such a development endangers the positions of these museums, which are at risk of either becoming commercially overwhelmed sites, or of losing visitors owing to the lack of the substantial funding that is required for their proper functioning.

4. The Yugoslav exhibition at the Auschwitz-Birkenau State Museum represents the paradigmatic example of this renewing permanent exhibitions phenomenon. Its long history and current search for a new manner of realization illustrate the whole process of memorialization and the phases through which the memory of the camp and its victims has changed since 1945.

---

<sup>12</sup> (Adorno 1967:16).



On September 29<sup>th</sup> 1963 in the Auschwitz-Birkenau State Museum the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia opened its national exhibition on the first floor of Block 17. Representatives of the local Oswiecim population, around 200 ex-inmates from Yugoslavia and officials of the Yugoslav and Polish states were present at the opening.<sup>13</sup> The exhibition contained 90 panels of 230 photographs, facsimiles, sculptures and graphics illustrating simultaneously the life and suffering of the Auschwitz and other Concentration Camp inmates and the Yugoslav antifascist struggle during the Second World War. The exhibition was opened on the initiative of the Federal Union of the People's Liberation War Fighters – an organization of war veterans that included former camp inmates as well. This exhibition was realized according to the plans of the architect Branko Bon and several other artists, amongst whom Vida Jocić was the most distinguished, as sculptor and surviving inmate of the Auschwitz camp. The exhibition was divided into three parts. The first part was designed to perform a sacred function. At the entrance, a commemorative plaque and stone were set down as a place for remembering and honouring the victims. The first room represented the struggle against fascism on the Yugoslav territory, focusing on the Partisan movement and the role of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia in that movement. The photographs, documents and maps exhibited testified to the scope of the fascist terror in Yugoslavia and Europe. The second part of the exhibition was marked with the stained glass panels symbolizing, as was stressed, the defiance of the Auschwitz inmates. The exhibition included information on the number of the Yugoslav inmates and their fates in the camp. During the summer of the next year, Yugoslav President Josip Broz Tito visited the exhibition and the Museum with the intention of significantly demonstrating the importance of the whole project for the Yugoslav state and society, and for its positioning in the divided world of the Cold War.

---

<sup>13</sup> The Auschwitz–Birkenau State Museum was established by special decree of the Polish Government in July 1947. From 1960 onwards, national exhibitions were opened in the Museum at the initiative of the former inmates' associations.



In anticipation of the celebrations for the 45th anniversary of the end of the Second World War, huge interventions and restorations of monuments and museums were realized all over Yugoslavia during the late 1980s. Among the numerous activities planned to mark the approaching anniversary was the renovation of the permanent exhibition in the Auschwitz–Birkenau State Museum in 1988. The institution responsible for the new exhibition was the Museum of the Revolution of the Nations and Nationalities of Yugoslavia, from Belgrade. Four years later, the Museum of the Revolution, together with the state whose history it was representing, was deconstructed, and its funds were incorporated into a new museum institution named The Museum of Yugoslav History. Unexpectedly, the exhibition in Poland outlasted the state that had set it up. In 2002, on the initiative of Croatia, it was closed for visitors and officially sealed in 2009.

The main reasons for the closure were listed by its initiator, Croatia: Yugoslavia no longer existed as a state, and after twenty years, the ideological and political realities, and the interpretations of the past, had substantially changed; the exhibition presented only copies of photographs and documents, which mostly could be seen in other

national settings; all the textual explanations were only in Serbo-Croatian and Polish; some historical data were not precise, or were incorrect – and the example chosen was the number of victims in the Jasenovac Concentration Camp under the Croatian Ustasha regime.



The Auschwitz–Birkenau State Museum management invited the Serbian Ministry of Culture, and the Museum of Yugoslav History as the successor institution of the former Museum of the Revolution, to answer accordingly. In June 2011, the Ministry of Culture, Media and Information Society of Serbia convened the first meeting with the representatives of all the former Yugoslav Republics, on the status of the former Yugoslav exhibition space. The participants at the meeting confirmed the attitude of all the former Yugoslav Republics not to divide up the exhibition space, but to prepare a joint permanent exhibition. It was the first time that the six independent states had agreed to work together on a common exhibition about the crimes committed during World War II and the Holocaust/Shoah. This process was considered remarkable and important, bearing in mind the fact that the states had faced the conflicts and wars between each other less

than 20 years ago. So a shared interpretation of the history was perceived as the best way to foster the process of understanding and reconciliation among these states in the present.

The International Steering Group was established with the aim of providing the necessary help in the organization of the future activities. These decisions were reconfirmed at the level of the ambassadors of the former Yugoslav Republics, who met at the Auschwitz–Birkenau State Museum in Poland in October the same year.



Six meetings on this subject took place in Belgrade (June 2012), Sarajevo (December 2012), Skopje (April 2013), the Auschwitz–Birkenau Museum (July 2013), Zagreb (February 2014) and Ljubljana (May 2015), with the support of UNESCO’s Venice Office, and within the framework of the global initiative “Culture: a bridge to development”. The meetings were attended by experts from the Shoah Memorial (France), The Topography of Terror (Germany) and the Holocaust Memorial Museum (USA), and the representatives of the Auschwitz–Birkenau State Museum and the National Fund for Victims of National Socialism from Austria as observers.



The meetings led to a general agreement on the framework and content of the exhibition. During the Skopje meeting in April 2013, the working groups agreed to prepare the first selection of items for the new exhibition. They were divided into 4 thematic chapters: Time and Space, Victims, Perpetrators and Collaborators, Resistance.

During the fourth meeting, in Auschwitz-Birkenau in July 2013, the participants presented a first selection of items and texts structured along the four chapters of the exhibition. This allowed for a clear definition of the inner structure of each chapter, as well as a precise listing of the elements still to be integrated. According to the selected materials, the Editorial Board was able to produce a short presentation of the complicated history of the region of former Yugoslavia within the focus of the Second World War. Most of the information was collected from the materials provided by the experts from each country involved in the joint project.



The whole idea and effort of all the participants to organize an international exhibition among the national exhibitions in the Auschwitz Museum received the unanimous support of the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance at the conference which was organized in Manchester in December 2014. The idea was perceived as a unique attempt to create a museum forum that would overcome the conflicting interpretations of the past, and present a shared historical narrative of the events that took place in Yugoslavia during the Second World War.



At the final meeting, in Ljubljana, all the sides accepted the draft proposal for the future exhibition created by the Editorial Board and decided to await the formal agreement between the state officials. At the same time, the results of the Serbian experts were presented to the

Serbian public at the exhibition “Auschwitz – The Final Destination”, in the Historical Museum of Serbia in May 2015. Following the concept adopted by the participants in the project, the Belgrade exhibition presented the fates of those who were taken to Auschwitz–Birkenau from the territory of present-day Serbia.

Today, after two and a half years, all the participants in the project are waiting for the final approval of the respective states’ officials.

