

Dealing With the Past

Survey & Consultation Exercise
Analysis of Interviews done in Croatia

Writer: Vesna Kesic

Translation: Zvezdana Balazic-Abbott

Quaker Peace & Social Witness

August 2003

NOTE: This is first draft of translation, in need to be corrected, digested and edited. Due to computer problems this is only version ready for the Committee meeting on September 6th 2003.

Contents/ structure

I. Introduction (methodology)

II. Perspectives of facing the past*

1. What does the term facing the past mean to the interviewees?
2. How far back in the past are the interviewees ready to go?
3. Why do we need to face the past?
Do we accomplish anything by facing the past?
Can the present peace be accomplished without facing the past?
4. Is facing the past a priority? What key topics do interviewees realise by facing the past? How ready are the interviewees to listen to the experiences of other groups?
5. Which specific obstacles are being identified with facing the past?
In whose interest would it be to stop the process of facing the past?

III. Activities (known, existing) around facing the past?

IV. How to face the past?

1. Suggestions of the interviewees about how to face the past
2. Regional-Local relations
3. Attitudes on the relations of the committees for the truth and peacemaking and courts

V. Support needed for the process of the facing the past

VI. Conclusions & Recommendations

* Croatian translation of term 'Dealing with past' used in the Survey was closer to English term 'Facing the Past'. This is due the fact that term 'Suocavanje s proslosti' (Facing the Past) is already in use among activists and in some ongoing projects. However appropriateness of these terms and their translations was also matter of discussion as mentioned by some interviewees.

I. Introduction

For the need of QPSW in Croatia 42 people have been interviewed in 27 conducted interviews, from 15 NGOs (see the list) mostly of peace and human rights profile, Media, Catholic Church and University institutions. There were 22 individual interviews, 3 pairs and 2 group interviews conducted.

The sample of the interviewed persons could be described according to J.P. Lederach* -as belonging to both middle and bottom level of social pyramid, almost equally distributed among two of them.

Middle level represents "opinion makers", people who have access both to the political elite and "grass-root". The bottom level represents "community leaders" and 'grass-root' peace and human rights activists, persons which communicate and influence within smaller or grass roots communities. The interviews have been conducted on the basis of a questionnaire, according to the rules and needs of the project, there also appear some added questions, put by Goran Bozicevic, who is an experienced activist in the field of peace building and peace initiatives in Croatia and the Balkan region.

Interviews have been analysed on the basis of the transcripts, by focusing on ideas, experiences and knowledge, basic topics, which show up in interviews, and problems, which the interviewees have detected concerning the process of facing the past in Croatia, as well as, in the other countries of ex-Yugoslavia. The conclusion is a sum of basic ideas which came up during the analysis of the interviews, as have some recommendations about possible duration and activities connected with the process and potential project of facing the past.

Recommendations apply to the work with individual groups and public work within the societies and countries that were created after the fall of Yugoslavia (SFRJ). While working on this report, the project facilitator, G.Bozicevic, and the reporter, Vesna Kesic, regularly met at least once a month, from February till August 2003 - exchanging ideas, experiences and information. The report is part of a long term process of cooperation and advice sharing.

The interviews have been conducted from February till May 2003 and they each lasted about one hour. The analysis of the interviews started after the majority of interviews have been finished, and the analysis did not follow the succession of the interviewees being interviewed. I would like to mention that the succession of questions and the analysis of the interviews were done according to diversity, concerning the place of origin, type of organisation and profession, that is, political-activist orientation of the interviewee. I have chosen that procedure intentionally so that in the beginning I get to look into the bigger variety of ideas and experiences given, and therefore a wide spectrum of suggestions and recommendations about the possible future work on the subject. The presumption has shown to have been a correct one.

1 John Paul Lederach: Building Peace - Sustainable Reconciliation in Divided Societies,1997. Lederach describes the possible sample of social research as the pyramid on which top there are the politics and other elite public groups, in the middle, the journalists, local political leadership and other opinion-makers, that is decision-makers, where on the bottom of the pyramid are the leaders of the local communities, NGOs and others. Although they are by number the largest groups and have a direct influence in the communities they live in, they would rarely be in the focus of the social studies.

At the analysis of the interviews and the systematisation of the material, I have followed the topics/questions given from the team which prepared the project (see terms of reference).

But, during the analysis of the interviews, it came up that some topics were impossible to take one from the other, because they crossover so much. That's especially seen in the first section (Perspectives) which should according to the guidelines be holding the most sub-topics. The interviewed individuals were not all willing to answer every question or did not have the knowledge, that is, opinions about certain topics, or sometime did not make out the sub-topics. Therefore, in accordance with the terms of reference, the analysis does not follow the suggested frame of work, and also does not follow the succession of questions and answers from the structured Questionnaire. I have found this to be particular because the answers of the interviewees were often scattered, and because also during interviewing and the analysis some new topics/ questions were added (eg. problem of the relations between the committees for the truth and reconciliation, and about this there was no direct question put). G. Bozicevic and myself, both have, during consultations, come to realise what was missing in the interviews or that it was not emphasised enough. There is more about this in the section of Conclusions.

Quotations, as the illustration of individual views have been used so far as to express a very typical and very unusual and rare opinions, while the rest of the analysed material is sorted in particular groups which came as the analysis was taking place.

II Perspectives of facing the past

II 1. What does the term Facing the past mean for the interviewees?

Most interviewed in Croatia, they represent in a great number the sample of the activist in the NGO sector which have work in the field of peacemaking or worked with the people with war experience (trauma, human rights, refugee/returnee status, minorities, participants of the war, etc.), are very aware of the problem and the importance of the process of facing the past and unhappy about the process that has taken up to now. But one can see the different approach and different understanding of the problem, which comes out of different status and views of groups and individuals. One part of the interviewed spoke from personal experiences, while the others approached the subject from secondary experience, in the groups that I have mentioned, or some general, ideological view on the problem, but all the approaches generally crossed over.

At the first look it was obvious that at trying to define "what does the term facing with the past meant for the interviewed" - a certain doubt about the term occurs: *"Really, what does it really mean in Croatia today? (Bodog); "When I read this question, what does facing the past mean in Croatia today, I do not know how much this word "facing" is clear?(Raffai)*

Answers, however, show that the interviewees themselves have a relative clear term what facing the past means and which its meaning and social

and political importance, but most of them want to point out that:

a) in Croatian public the term "past" as well as the meaning of the process of facing the past is not enough known or not defined; and therefore the subject of serious discussions.

b) that, there is several different levels of possible facing the past; there are two basic

ones - personal and collective 'facing with the past' - that is the division of the private and public sphere

Many emphasize (and identify as one of the main problems/obstacles when 'facing') that those two levels can develop separately- in family-one 'past' is spoken about and that 'past' is accepted as the 'truthful' one, whereas in public - there are no existing standards, nor processes which would make it possible to look into the past in a proper way.

Kruno Sukic: " There is no doubt that we have the need, a lot of us, that we face the past in a way that would be known or maybe even more than that- to make the 'facing' public. Because, personally, I can on a daily basis 'face' it alone by myself, within myself."

c) 'facing with the past" must run on both levels (private and public; collective and individual)

K. Sukic: "the inductive approach is wanted mostly maybe because we miss Live, -not rehearsed stories, those who have come out of a free discussion. It seems to me that this kind of 'facing with the past" would help the participants to become free of fear, pain and prejudice. When I speak of becoming free of fear, I have the need to, above all, emphasize the feeling that the people did not free themselves politically, that is the 'facing with the past' does not happen free of the political and ideological pressures."

They connect the interviewed process of 'facing with the past' with several other terms that have not been dealt with in public- like justice, blame, responsibility, peace-making, forgiveness, rebuilding trust, truth and coexistence. Most interviewed, although, not all, speak about these topics, generally, that the majority of the Croatian population, had the need to face its own 'bad' past, that is with the 'crimes which were committed by and in the name of Croats and Croatian state. But, we have to take into account, that the interviewees were peace activists and human rights workers who try to establish a dialog between different (ethnic) groups which were in conflict during the war. So, the interviewees, except for some of them, relatively rarely referred to the crimes and injustice done to the majority of the population, that is they were less specific when it concerns those crimes. The exception, that is one-way position about the question of 'facing' we find in one case, the focus group in Zadar:

' When Croatia is concerned, it seems to me, for the just peace in the region, it would be necessary for Serbia to apologise for all that it has caused and has done, that is, the former people in power in Serbia, apologize for what it has done in Croatia. I think that by far they were responsible for all that had happened in the region of ex-Yugoslavia. That would be necessary and vital for the resolving of the conflict in the region. Croatia was a victim in the war, and without that apology, peace in

the region is not possible.

Religious influenced opinion, which were rare in this interviews, call upon the Christian obligation to forgiveness, but that forgiveness, so to say, is not 'condition free' - *"I agree that one should forgive and I have forgiven in my heart, but the one that has caused the 'evil' must do its part. Like we talk on our courses, (Kursiljo), one should apologize, ask for forgiveness, and own up for the damage done. Then we can talk about peacemaking. We can forgive, but we can reach the peace only then when the one who caused the damage and badness pays for it. Not that we do something bad in return, but that whoever has done it owns up for the damage. Forgive- yes, but forget - we cannot."*

Most interviewed, however, do not see the past as 'ethnically coloured', but as a product of historical and political circumstances.

The same as the term 'facing the past' and its related topics, so is the period controversial which in that 'facing the past' should be defined as 'past'

II.2. How far back in the past are people prepared to go in 'facing' it?

A question appears as a prime distinction- do we count the past from WWII or should we focus on the process exclusively on the past period of the conflict on the Balkans, that is the recent events, pre- war, war-time, and post-war past?

At the valuation of which the periods should be taken in consideration for the contemporary work on the past- different opinions show: those who think that going back in the distant past would be counter- productive because it turns away from the recent events and threatens dangerously to the 'fixation on the past'.

M.Uzelac: 'to talk about what was happening, to us these years, a bit before the war, during the war and after, it looks to everyone reasonable, but facing with the distant past, in this place - if you say to people 'facing to antifascism and communism' would be taken wrongly, because it depends on what side it is politically perceived. One must not forget that the situation in Croatia now- it is a transitional one, that is the political groups are fighting for the power and that there are different connotations.

Igor Miosic: 'I think that we have a situation that we have after six, Seven years, after we have idealized the Homeland war, come to some pieces of information that maybe not everything was exactly ideal as we have thought. So firstly, that 'facing' with the past would then be facing with some events in the Homeland war.

Another 'block' is made of the people who are much more focused on the past of the WWII, than on the recent past. Those with unresolved questions from that period see causes and a close link to recent warfare (*Kulovic: 'Facing the past today in Croatia for me means firstly fencing off from Croatian past from WWII and defining some bad sides of the Homeland war in which the Croatian state was formed as is it is now. I am appalled, that there is no*

Distancing oneself and possibilities of facing with what the term 'endehazija' meant, (the WWII State NDH), is that the prior State to Croatia today or, was that just an 'incident' in Croatian history. And if one cannot say that something was wrong during the times of NDH, then one cannot say that anything was wrong in the Homeland war.

D. Lalic: WWII, which in some way has not finished here, and the events from that war very much influence, not only the political, but also the cultural events of today. There are still symbols and some slogans from that period to be seen even to this day.

B. Mijakovac: 'I connect WWII with Jasenovac. The place is obviously still an unhappy memory in the souls of the Serbs, so that in the end it reappeared as a traumatic memory because of the, still, unresolved and not reached catharsis about Jasenovac.'

In the opinion of a smaller number of interviewees, the period between 1945 till 1990 should be taken in the process of facing with the past., that is the period of the existence of ex-Yugoslavia.

V. Terselic: 'For me, 'facing the past' means 'to face with what had happened in WWII, what had happened between the wars- the crimes that were committed during time of socialism and communism and facing with what had happened in the last war, the Homeland war, as they call it.

The unresolved term of the past, like the non-existing debates, and no consensus in public about what period of the past should intensify the public dialog, in opinion of many, creates confusion and even a doubt in the everyday reality, and 'when really does the 20th century start', or 'when did the war in ex-Yugoslavia exactly start'. Unclear is the term "past" and its content has as the consequence a string of social handicaps- one of those handicaps is suppressing other important topics or 'talking about facts' from public discourse and from the collective memory. The impossibility of talking about facts is being mentioned, which

refers to the 50 years of Yugoslav history and the fear to talk about that period in public, which some kind of a reduction of the past and facing the same past. By that we think of the 'positive past' from the period of ex-Yugoslavia and the antifascism - like part of the past from WWII and the period of communist repression and the recent wars that generally are mentioned as 'the bad past'. About- what part of the past, that is how far back one needs to go when facing it, *Kruno Sukic says: "That depends on the type of discussion or the type of discourse. About -is 'the facing 'happening on the level of the private, intimate conversation, or is it happening on the level of the employee of one organization, or is it happening in public- 'facing' in the eye of the media, on the conferences of scientists, historiographers and historians. My experience is that it depends on the pragmatic aspect, so as to say, it depends on the field on which one can and want to use views into which will come out of the 'facing with the past' process. If the process of looking into are to be used in our perception of the present, then it will be better if it is possible that the 'facing with the past' happens for the period of the traumatic last thirteen years. But the experience tells me that all of us who live half a century necessarily must*

go deeper, if we do not want to fall in the danger to speak within the field which is defined by the already existing speech.

II.3. Why do we need to face the past? Does facing the past reach anything? Can the peace be kept even without 'facing the past'?

The reason why this community needs to deal with the past all interviewees see in the past, that is the quality of the contemporary life, in overcoming the war, trauma and the trauma of the past and the possibility of making the future. But there are some diverse opinions about the aspect of contemporary life, that is which social groups suffer the most, or stay cut off because they do not 'get to face' - and the public dialog about the past. The reasons to deal with the past can be divided into several groups, concerning how the interviewees define it:

a) pragmatic reasons. (so the communities can alone deal with oneself; facing with the past makes the realistic look into the present possible). One interviewee, psychiatrist by profession (S. Kulovic) - points out that facing with the past is facing with the problems as to the purpose of their resolution, and not so that the problem or its doer do not get to be identified as being problematic.

b) social-political reasons. (point out to "normalize";)to stop working on human rights, stop being a 'diversion'; because in countries where facing the past was done relatively systematically, as e.g. in former West Germany - the radical right wing is weaker than in those in which it was not done - as in former East Germany, Switzerland, Austria)

c) softening of the nationalistic boost: in the countries of ex-Yugoslavia (facing the separation of the ethnical groups in : "We Serbs" - "we Croatsians")

d) facing de-legitimises the war and legitimates the peace

e) transforming the past into the 'past' , that is history, instead of 'recycling' the past and constantly turning back to the same unresolved topics from the past: ' things that have been done badly in the past, one must understand that they were bad, because otherwise one will be forced to repeat it"; 'it should be obvious that it is necessary to face, work on and put the past behind, and that it is in the interest of the public because with it, one stops the daily manipulations of the past through different party and other interests."

f) making the future possible to happen: 'the fact, that we have not faced the past, is an obstacle to free our creative potentials and that we make our future real."

g) division of society around the past that is not looked into and not made theme-like

h) building of trust in the society and its institutions as the rebuilding of trust between sides that were in the conflict.

i) creating new, positive ideology: " facing the past is always facing with the past ideologies, and it is also important in making some new ideologies"

j) facing the past, except on the social and collective level, it is important on the individual level-because - *Matulic: " I believe that there is a need for something like that, because I think that it is right that*

every man faces with his own past, no matter what it was like. If one does not, and if that past is being avoided, in some way comes to forgetfulness. No literally, but in somewhat neglect towards the past, or even the emotional forgetting, emotional coolness towards something. If we neglect something, than it is not present in our lives, and at the end of the time it ceases to exist. Of course, new found empty slots are ideal places for "sowing" new experiences, that is, interpretations, which did not happen in reality.

Important reasons of facing the past on the collective level, that is, in the public, written was *demystification and taking over of the responsibility for that past - committed crimes or mistakes, instead of blaming the others (Germans, Italians, Venetians, Turks, Serbs). Past that has not been looked into make a 'distorted picture about ourselves like someone unmistakable) without sin, one who was always attacked, one that has always been put down without a reason, victim of some unfortunate historical circumstances and some kind of a 'sobering process" (Bodog). Facing also makes the past clear of the ignorance, possible, the triumphant feeling and pushing into (collective) subconsciousness" - which then comes back like bad consciousness, shame, irritation, need for reconstruction, defensiveness.*

Society, which did not face nor has worked on its own past, in which nobody took any responsibility and established individual guilt (including the courts) stays divided into victims, doers, observers and those who have defied the crimes. If those groups do not communicate among one another, and do not interact by looking into the past and its evaluation, the society will be divided and we cannot function normally. *"I think that veterans of the Homeland war cannot find its place within the Croatian society, without being servants to the right political wing if we do not really define some things which are essential" (Kulovic)*

G.Bodog mentions that it is important to make sure that the given categories are not impossible to bridge over, that is- that the roles can change - someone from being a victim can become the doer, which also needs to be tackled in the process of facing the past.

The participants very often emphasize the need of facing the past because of the future generations which in an unresolved past can not take over their normal role in the society, because they stay trapped in the "schizophrenic past".

Because of absence, and taboo-making of some topics from the past, society is left without the information on individual fates. Interviewees here point out two groups of those citizens - the minority of the population (Serbs), whose suffering and fate does not reach the majority, but also one part of the participants of the Homeland war, whose stories, actually the truth do stand away from the official 'story'. At the same time, one part of the population "dug" itself in" the role of the victims, which to them and their surroundings, as the society in whole, does not help the normalization and makes a general "victimization" story.

Several participants state - that facing with the past -leaving out the making of the valuation system-important (defining what was good and what

was bad) that is, the absence of setting moral criteria for the group, in this case the people or citizens of Croatia.

Not differentiating good and evil, creates an atmosphere of desperation and apathy, and has a de-motivating effect. The situation is sometimes compared with individual life: *"All of us have done something good and something bad in our lives and if It has not been said what was good, and what was bad - we can continue with the bad"*.

It must be said so that the group can survive, the nation, the community, and the individuals. The same interviewee (Ana Raffai) has especially emphasized that as a Croatian she has a goal, that with the help of facing with the past and seeing into its bad parts one day the people who belong to this nation can "become glad that they are Croatians" and reach normalization and make new visions of coexistence in the region possible. Making the guilt individual, the Croatians should then stop the animosity towards the Serbs, so that they, should not be condemned to--- or have anything to do with the Serbs nor a coexistence a la Yugoslavia- then they would be looking for some other, fourth, fifth or tenth way".

In the life of a nation, avoiding facing what had happened at "the birth of a nation" and during the recent past, functions as "avoiding oneself in the individual life": "If you avoid being born, how can you be/exist afterwards. There is the continuity in existence. "(Kulovic)

As an important reason, the need to face the past a more global context has been talked about": *not looking into the matters will exclude us from the world in which the value system and communication is based on condemning the crime of fascism and a realistic look of the past. Terselic:" it is a fact that the antifascist coalition in Europe, when WWII ended, had won the war. That is not very clear in Croatia, and the question reappears to - who actually won the war?!. That is not interesting from the point of view of the winner-looser perspective - but it is interesting because what happens to us all the time is that we fall in some pocket - interpretations that sound like we are in 1943. -"*

But some participants show that facing with the past is not necessary and is not always (in history) seen as wanted, nor will it necessarily have a social positive and wanted effect: *T. Ponos:" I want to remind you of the Westphalia Peace Accord, with which the 30-year old war ended, which can rightfully be thought of as the first proper European war, in which,, approx 2/5 of the German population were killed. In that Peace Accord the following was stated:" what happened, happened" - something like - we will not go back to the past, we will not go back to the old, because we know that it will upset us greatly. On the one hand, there is an argument, that only if we face and go through the process of 'facing with the past', that the past will not come back, therefore, that it will not happen again. but, a similar argument can be used for an opposite thesis - that if we face the past it will disturb/distress many people and so then again, maybe, someone will turn too left or too right and maybe again -the lobby will start - and maybe a start of an ideology, which brought all the bad things, with what, let's say, we want to face. The danger of not facing with the past as shown*

on the example of the ex-Yugoslavia and Yugoslav communist authorities after 1945, who refused facing their own past, firstly, I think of Bleiburg and other similar things, and then all that came flooding back 45 years after. Of course, they have swept one grain of dust under the carpet. When that in the end, when it came out of the carpet, it was a whole mess. Well that's a real problem. There is no one-way solution.

The reason why we need to face the past many bring in connection with the potential process of the truth and peace-making: "everything needs to be said, so we can go forward and forgive. Because without forgiveness there is no coexistence. (Galo)"

"Admitting guilt, court sentencing and "regret", well, socially healing processes: for the survivors it is very important to see that, on the one hand, that the person who did the crime takes responsibility for what he has done and that he regrets it: (Terselic)

"We can reach the peace only if we accept the truth, face it and forgive" (Kursiljo group in Zadar)

There are very different and controversial opinions about the questions of the truth, peacemaking and forgiveness – that is something that will be discussed later.

II.4. Is facing with the past a priority? Which key subjects have the interviewees seen when facing with the past? How ready is the public to face up to the past?

All those interviewed think that facing and working on the past is an important problem of a contemporary society, and political system, although, except for one, they do not explicitly state it as priority of the Croatian society or the region.

Vojko Ivica: "If anything has a priority - then it is facing the past is important, but it is not a priority to reach normalization, nor in Croatia or in the Region." Europe is Europe as a region, not as a State and Croatia will therefore connect with the other countries of ex-Yugoslavia, maybe not on the regional basis then on some other. When the Serb tourist starts coming to Dalmatia, from the economical point of view - there will be the connection- first the economy of course" (D. Lalic)

That is: B. Kondic: "I think that both is important, the economy is definitely important, but that does not mean that the past is less important. The economical security brings a basic kind of peace, but the look on (unresolved past on the other hand, brings unsettled feeling. I think for reaching the real peace - both instances must be satisfied) That's why I would not separate those two processes. I think that we can talk about priorities, to satisfy the basic one that we need to stay alive/living and to survive and straight after comes this part (work on the past) I think that these processes need to go simultaneously.

More relevant in that sense makes the answer how much is "facing the past" momentarily realistic.

Puhovski: To the question whether it is like in other situations of the similar kind, in other communities: Probably now it is, but it will not become if it does not start to be shoved bit by bit and do something about it."

Marina Skrabalo: "When I see the word "realistic", straight away to my mind comes, that in Croatia there never was a realistic facing with the past. Because this is the country a place and a society that does not face with its past almost 50 years, and foremost, we can say, another 50 years, and simultaneously, all the time it refers to the past.

The interviewees stated a very big spectrum of questions. One of the main problems is "the non-existence of the public" in which the past would be talked about, especially, creating the public that those "other ones" had the right and the possibility of presenting their views of things happened, their experiences, their stories and their truth. Bodog: "one organizes the need and the right of some to talk about the past, whereas, in the same time negate the right to others to give their testimonies and their interpretations"

Croatian public is not ready to face the past especially not facing up to the crimes that were committed in its name. The political culture, the lack of democratic tradition, the ruling public discourse and domination of the collective tradition (prejudices about being Croatian as being something self-explanatory) is a context that many identify as a subject or a problem at which one should work on so that a relevant conversation can start and so the process of facing the past. However, even alone the participants of the research sometimes see differently the influence of the ideology:

Kruno Sukic: "To me, the source of the problem is in the nationalistic discourse, nationalistic interpretation of identity. I find this source of oppression because of the need even in the beginning an eternally complex problem to be understood through dogma and ideology, and not from reality - from which one needs to start the facing. Then the understanding and resolve that is offered - come from put on assumptions"

I. Miosic: "We are a society that is ideologized. The other day, I was on a discussion panel - the subject was - new research in the field of genetics, that should confirm that the Croatian origin is namely Iranian, and not Slavic. And as much as that are scientific results that are exact, and therefore needn't be influenced by ideology, the discussion which started turned into a conflict between the "ustasa" and the "partisans" - so, every conflict in our country at the end reduces itself to that particular conflict."

Some have very clear and limited subjects and fields that needed to be faced with.

D. Pilsel: "These are questions of the ustasa and the communists rule of fear; the faith and the nationalistic boiling in religious communities, ustasa revision in the era of Tudjman rule, mass violation of human rights, war in Bosnia and Herzegovina, etc.-

K.Kruhonja: "I would like if we could talk about whether the war was unavoidable, or we had other ways for the independence. Have we used the

situation, which, as Banac says, was a unique - situation that made the change possible, when there was different ways to answer to the given chance. How much did we creatively influence the situation to avoid the war, and to have another way for making political goals of independence real? Then, what was the character of this war? And what was the intervention of the Croatian leading party and Croatian army in Bosnia?

*Momcinovic:" after WWII, national question was avoided, swept under the carpet, as authoritative, or absolute, as you wish, system - they were taken off by forces from the order of the day by profession and politics. The national question in the whole of Yugoslavia was, as it is seen now after the fall, the key question, which nobody paid no attention to, and none was resolving it in any way. The tensions were growing, especially with the start of the economic crisis, which in the end influenced this bloody conflict, because the nationalistic feelings were risen and the nationality questions became the key for every nation, which made up our state. Facing the past for me means firstly a valorisation of the role of the nation, politics during the WWII and its valuation **how** the war actually happened and **what** had happened on the territory of Yugoslavia.*

The fixation to the recent past now of the minority population of Serbs, is also one of the problems of facing: the representatives of my people still tell the same stories and have not moved since 1991. (B. Mijakovac) as are: some specific psychological processes which rule with the citizens of the Serb population: the principle of the defeated rules. I think that the situation is being idealized - I gave up and I try all my ideology which I have built earlier, and is not anymore valued, I should throw it somewhere in the corner. I come here with open arms. I say - what was all this for. Humble, in behaviour, so that people make a conclusion that I am ok, straight, without spots in the past. But then I realize that that's not how it goes - I think the worse thing that can happen to me is that I say one thing when I'm with the representatives of the national minority, and the other, when it's a mixed group of people, and thirdly, when I'm with the group of the national majority. Among the representatives of the Serb national minority, for e.g. someone said that the man who filmed "Oluja" (Storm over Krajina, documentary on destroying thousands of Serb houses after the military operation in August 1995 ended) was killed.

Armed conflicts (wars) on the territory of ex-Yugoslavia, their causes and direct consequences in the way of victims, war trauma etc. are not, however, the only subjects that the process of the facing with the past should entail. The consequences go deep in all social parts of life, so that, in the opinion of many, the facing itself, should include a very wide spectrum of social layers. That is, a certain public consensus should be reached- what is we want to face from the past.

T. Ponoc: "We have to answer to ourself what it is we would want to face, what period we would wish to face? Do we want to face only the war or any possible and impossible consequences of the war? Do we wish to face the war-profiteers? That's one thing that is very little talked about. Are we going to leave this to some state revision department and then whatever happens - happens, and we all know that nothing will happen- or, are we going to be facing with more or less just the 'slaughter' ?

A big number of interviewed put the emphasis on the need to establish the facts concerning the past and passed conflict. On a more specific level of identification: "key questions/subjects" which we have to face, the following was stated:

-we should establish how the war exactly started, well, not the question of the exact moment, which is interesting, but the context, that is, the political analysis of the causes and the dynamic of the war. (in conversations with some colleagues, who are serious and quiet people, we have cleared four of five dates - which we found to be correct, but we really do not know when the war really started,)That is an important segment of facing because it shows that it has got to do with one snail-paced war which evolved slowly and which suddenly became aware when the events passed a certain stage - " if we cannot agree on the beginning, it will be far harder to come to the conclusion as to how and why the war started, what were the causes"(Puhovski)

*- second very important question is the correlation of this war and the legend or the truth about the earlier conflict (WWII)"There can be found a lot of books about the conflict of the ex-Yugoslavia in English, German, French language, in which a phrase reoccurs that the basic cause is the long history (many centuries) of the conflict of the Serbs and Croats. When the people are told that **there has never been a conflict between Serbs and Croats until 1991**, everyone is slightly flabbergasted, and think that someone represents some kind of integral Yugoslavia, or I do not know, another thesis, and of course again we have a misunderstanding of the facts." (Puhovski)*

- all that is very connected with the third question, namely, with the catastrophic experience of the period of Yugoslavia from 1945 till 1990 because, Yugoslavia functioned in the way- as to sweep the past under the carpet and that's the real reason of its fall. To speak the truth about all passed periods. I have come out of the JNA (Yugoslav national army) in 1991, joined the Croatian army, I had no idea about Bleiburg. From the military operations on the borders between Austria, Slovenia and Croatia. I had no idea that so many people got killed. I do not know why that was covered up. One should openly talk about it., face it, deal with it. And about pits, suffering on Goli Otok, one should openly say, not hide it. But a politician should not talk about it, who instead of making peace, even more brings the passions and hatred to boil.

- The story about Jasenovac was blown up. How many Serbs were killed? It was ugly to talk about it as it was blown out of proportions, and the truth was not correct. That's why it is bad to exaggerate or to lessen something. (Kursiljo)

- I find it especially important to document how people were killed, because I do not see how we are going to get rid of this suffocation. It is like there is a knot that doesn't allow the people in this country to start in any sensible direction. I find - before anything - this research work to be very important. (Terselic)

With the fact concerned the beginning of the war and its "brewing", the interviews, especially point out to the unknown facts concerning the Croatian military actions and interventions, same as the facts about some actions about some events in Croatia which are connected to the war operations

For e.g.

- discharge of judges from courts and State attorney's office because of the "wrong nationality" during the rule of HDZ

- Reducing the percentage of Serb citizens in Croatia in the period of 1990 till 2001 (three times, Puhovski), but the correct number and the dynamic of leaving (time and place etc.) were not known by the Croatian public, as well as the reasons - was it the propaganda of Milosevic and the Krajina authorities or Croatian military action and political pressures and exile.

- For me, one of the terrible examples was the media coverage, some, in truth severe violation of human rights, taking away human lives just because one was, for example, of Serb nationality and when the crime was done by the persons who were supposed to have been protecting our lives, and those were the professionals from MUP(police department)- and actually their chiefs, these persons still have not been rightfully sentenced. (Momcinovic)

Facts, except that they are missing, they are problematic even when you talk about their interpretation. There is no facts about particular events and research should be done, that is find them, for another group- the facts exist, but that is impossible to talk about it seriously.

People have a lot of different versions and find that those facts are not truth, they do not think that it is their side of the stories, but that they are facts. Confirmed facts should be the basis for discussion about causes and consequences of some events., that is the real content of the history.

Momcilovic: "Sarinic, alone, said on television, that, during the war, he, himself, had spoken, over 80 times directly, with Milosevic, and to people it does not mean anything. That means that the war was arranged, that ethnic cleansing was arranged, division of Bosnia was arranged, and that they have all the time been discussing and arranging how to continue - and let's not talk about the exchange of arms for oil and so on, that was going on during the whole war. While people were dieing in the trenches, others were looting and getting rich.

The level of experience, feelings, memories of events passed, are important for the process of facing with the past - how different, people or the survivors or those who did not want to know what was happening, what they feel about what had happened, what "taste was left in their 'mouths, what now, after 40 years, have passed from some events still pressures as the feeling. (Terselic)

It is also important to take account of the perception of certain groups - how the victims see the doers, how the doers see the victims, how the victims and the doers look upon and perceive the crimes and in the end what do victims feel as satisfaction, a compensation for suffered pain and loss. And what would be necessary to start the communication (cooperation)

between different groups and processes of healing - individual and collective. V. Terselic states to the danger of getting to know the facts, the truth and testimonies about crimes evoke re-traumatisation with the victims.

Biljana Kondic - states as the precondition for the beginning of the process of facing with the past, the following: *"I would take out the individual and collective guilt, that is a discussion about that subject. Important thing is that people face it, that something exists, something that is part of the individual. What he had done, if he had done something at all or did not do anything, not regarding if it falls into guilt or some good deed, and that there is the collective responsibility for something that did happen. Secondly, something that people should talk about, exactly why we were very close to some other people, particularly individuals, or they have done something to us. That means - we move from category of individuality to something that is collective. Now we should put it back again to that individual level, so it would be understood, that I do not have to hate it only because he belongs to another nation. In that way we will resolve maybe, step by step, some individual relations, and not only relations of the national communities. That for me, are two things, which are very important as the introduction in the story about all, as psychological preparation for the story, about what had happened. Of course, then some factual things follow: what happened, how did it happen, how it started and everything else."*

Two faith-inspired attitudes (Kursiljo): *"The same what our family is, that is our homeland, that is our state, that is our whole world. The basis is the same. Love and forgiveness - it is the only thing that can lead us, and only in that we will come to peace. Firstly, we should admit the sin, and we can start building the peace and forgive and watch the things objectively. Because if I do not start from that, then I am the other one, and then there is no peace."*

About the readiness of the public to face with the past - and listen to "the other side" - generally there is a negative opinion (the public is not ready), but there is an opinion the rejection comes out of a momentarily inadequate way of facing which is present in the public. Readiness to face also depends on the political context, that is even the ruling political party.

K.Kruhonja: *"I do not know if the public is ready to hear different views, although it is anyway, all the time bombed by different views. But in the way that is not a dialog - one that is not "heard" difficult. We are a society with a very high level of trauma. The way we will open the questions are very important, and the way they have been opening now, will bring the dialog very hard.*

Uzelac: *"In a non-political surroundings, and atmosphere people are ready to face. But there is a constant polarisation of the public and in that atmosphere they do not want to hear different opinions. But in a different moment, as soon as the political topics and politicising disappear, out of the daily politics, people are ready for facing different opinions. We have come far from what had happened, but if the change of political rule happened, if some other political party comes to power, people will be*

afraid again. I know very well how it was for me in the time of HDZ.

Fear overcomes people, because they are existentially threatened.

D.Pilsel: It depends on what section of the public we think about. I do not believe that the masses which gathered on the Ban Jelacic Square and greeted the handball sportsmen in the company of the singer known as Thompson who greeted everyone gathered with the slogan "za Dom" (For the Home) - is that crowd interested in that question at all."

Vojko Ivica: "Sincerely, I am not really sure that the public is ready to listen about the peace-making. I have the feeling that the big part of the public is not informed or informed only one way. That means that not enough is invested in educating or different type of contact with the public and that it is actually the key problem why we still do not recognize the wishes of the citizens (when we talk about the number of citizens) to listen to the stories on the subjects of trust and peace-making. On the other hand, it is very indicative, that when more organized and with a qualitative approach - it would make a great move forward.

The interviewed pointed out several moments that would help bring to life and the readiness of the Croatian public to face the past and accept hearing the other side.

a) to be informed about the need and importance of that process, as well as what had been done on that.

b) seeing the "gain" that comes out of the process of facing the past - individual and social

c) disappearance of prejudices which stop the normalization in the society and in the region

d) pluralisation of the public space (*K.Sukic: " My plans are connected with my own need that the political field multiplies in a bigger scale than it has been up to now. `Because of the fact that the socialist collectivism has been exchanged for the nationalistic and that, unfortunately, in a bigger scale, is like the - socialist type of socialisation, by which the collective, monopolized matrix stayed the same. I have the need to take part in the process which would show how much past is a hard question to deal with.*

II.5. What specific obstacles are identified by facing the past? In whose interest would it be to stop the process of facing the past?

The interviewed identify three main groups of obstacles:

1. those which come out of objective circumstances, that is political and social context

2. those which come out of subjective, personal reasons

3. those which are the combination of both 1 and 2

1. Among the first group (objective circumstances) the following is being stated"

- the first obstacle is on the "state level" - the lack of political will for facing with the past (Vojko Ivica: " *with the arrival of Racan to power, on the 3rd of January 2000) - he gave the first statement to citizens of Serb nationality - "you can start coming back freely " - we were happy*

about such statements, and believed there was a political will. We have to openly say - whether someone likes it or not - political will still does not exist, it stopped at the declaration level" and if we would analyse deeper we would be able to say that almost - while HDZ was on the power, most people returned. Someone would find it strange but the reasons are pretty clear: with the change of authority, all returnees have expected a lot. When they started returning, they did even get the minimum of that, it came to a big disappointment, and they started to go back and as a spoke as some kind of "living mail" about how actually there is no political will.

- political culture, that is historically-political violence which influenced the character of the contemporary authority and governing (D.Lalic: "*Obstacle is the political authority and the rule of politics in our lives. How much does politics dominate our lives., so are the spheres of our lives less important. The way of ruling which is directed to the governing body as the aim, and not the governing body as the means, which is the governing body of the ruler, and not the governing body of which serves the citizens and organisation of the social life generally in which the political members supervising committees do not like to lose and with that they are not ready to cause conflicts*)

- the quality and the way of reporting of the Media (Galo: "*Nobody wanted to show our documentary about the cohabitation and cooperation of ethnic groups in Lika. If we made a film about how some Serb used violence on a Croatian - it would have been shown at least once every week. That is the tragedy of our media*")

- the way the legal system functions in the State - how on the level of needed laws (acts) (about returning, for e.g. so are there laws on the local level, and whether the existing laws are carried out - (Vojko Ivica: "*no citizen of Serb origin cannot call upon the key moment like - security, starting from the survival, working places, making the roof over ones head, returning of properties, right to citizenship. It is stupid that people, whose families lived there a long time on that territory, have to prove that they are the citizens of Croatia. Galo: " Obstacles are big in bureaucratic and cases "being old" and non-functioning of the governing board. „Making the Return deliberately/consciously difficult.*

-educational system – is what we teach the children in schools about - the earlier and especially the recent past and also - Miosic": *We are in principle one uneducated society. I have been working on some statistics and I know, that 7.5 % of people have a university degree. And even those Universities are problematic. People are, actually, uneducated, they have very narrow views about the world and their surroundings.*

- the long period of not-worked on past and a lot of different conflict and crime from those periods. (Terselic: "*it is even hard to imagine how big a process would be needed to look into what had happened, in those different periods, to have it really documented, to see the material pieces of evidence, to have the names of all recorded, at least, the killed ones and definitely it is not realistic to expect that from this moment it will be, or ten years after, even if a difficult decision was reached to cover the*

period of WWII, the communist crimes and crimes done in the recent war)

- cleric nationalism, that is the link of the church and sometimes the State supported nationalism (*Vojko Ivica: "everything you want to solve and do - is seen through that option, whether someone is a Croatian or a Croatian-catholic or Croatian of another faith (religious belief), and we all know that none is guilty nor have merit, that he/she is born or has chosen in his/her life some other religion /faith. The fact that it is dragged through the legal system/legislation, still feels like there were double values in making the decisions about the legislation. We, who work on direct human rights recognize how certain judges, for the same thing make different decisions, depending whether someone is a Croatian- catholic or a Croatian of some other faith)*

K.Sukic: "the Catholic Church as an organization, is to me - already because of its dogmatic presumptions about the human being, the highest being, about the history, about the history of salvation, the role of the man and the woman in that history, somehow predestined for the mission of the prime-citizen. Christianity as an ideology, as the on look on life, as the mission, although it was, as it is historically confirmed, strongly supported by de-classed society, including those illiterate - the key thing is it was ran, thought by elite through the history up to this day. That was, one could say and it is the mission from "above" to deal with the "earthly business"."

- lack of professionals and the knowledge from the history- confirming historical facts which then reflects on the interpretation of contemporary life

- the general attitude that facing would create "problems", certain classes of society. A class has been created - "the war profit-makers" in different segments of society, as the consequence of the war and its personal interests (*K.Kruhonja: "when this recent war is concerned, I think that one of the important reason of manipulation and protection of personal interest - protection of criminal persecution - that out of herbs do not become war criminals. When the ordinary people are concerned who are not responsible positions - veterans, victims of war, returnees - there, I believe is the psychological need, especially with those who have lost a lot, not to make something dirty to what the have given, their suffering or suffering of their families. The war-lords are still in the leading positions in the society and politics - Galo:' politicians and soldiers, all of them from a waiter or bus driver, became, what they were and profited from it. Nobody touched that. They are the basic obstacle to the real facing with the past and for all their lootings. And these who came to power, and those before, they are the profiteers. They became business people, they have the power and the money and everything else. The link - politics - capital, on the other hand , continues functioning and because of the need of "stabilizing" the country, especially economy, without which it is impossible to get the foreign capital When we are talking about the possible influence of the international community, it seems to me, that it is not in their interest, it is not a priority. They are turned towards building a new kind of future,*

knowing that not much can be corrected in the past. And then rather, out of practical reasons, invest so that the economical and other situation softens a bit the trauma and unhappiness.

- unequal status (discrimination) of the Serb minority, in the relation to the majority of the population at a public presentation of their problems and their experiences (B. Kondic: "*I think that Serbs do not comment enough, that they actually, do not talk - about it. I think that they have the attitude: 'we will not now speak of the past anymore', we will go on, I would agree that the Croatian generalize more, but I am not sure that the Serbs side has the possibility nor that it takes, nor that it feels, in this moment, strong enough to even speak in that way. I think that they are not equal in this.*

- lack, unorganised and unavailability of information about the events from the past (Ponoc: "*when the approach to material is concerned, when the NGOs are concerned, what they were doing - basically, it is not hard to get, these are publicly accessible data. The trials are public if we talk about the justice system, so there is a lot of it available. The archives are still not accessible, and will not be for several decades, and the question is what state are they in; the question is - who keeps the documents and where are they kept. For an archive it is very important to have it as a collection of documents according to certain categories, events and periods, from 1991 till 1995, that was not done, so the documents about one event can be on 10, 14 20 addresses, which will definitely make this job slow.*

- generally bad economic situation, especially how it has been affecting the young people - *I wanted to say about young people - they are frustrated by being unemployed - having small wages, differences that someone lives better, and someone on the verge of existence, and there, the resistance towards forgiveness rises, because they think that if there was no war, they would live better today. So that it comes to the situation that, a young person does not know how, so he/she hides away, does not have the will for anything, he/she has enough of their own problems. They do not care. (Kursiljo)*

- political parties and their interest: I am just thinking, that the main part of the society are the small people, not the elite, nor the political parties - if you look at the political parties - then, the situation is pitiful. Everyone of them ideologically pulls to its side - that is - as Ivo Matulic says: "*in Croatia, that is, facing with the past occurs every day, only - that past is an already established structure in which every individual has to fit in. Croatian society needs to face with a different aspect of the past, which was neglected, so to say, and is not at all present in the minds of the people, practically, people are avoiding it.*"

Specific is the opinion (Kursiljo), which states that the absence of the apology from the Serb side "*slow the process of normalization or to try to live in this part freely, that people will not slaughter one another, but that they will be living like people and that they will not wait another 50 years to have the "war axes" out. Unfortunately, nobody insists on that, as far as I know.*"

2. At "subjective obstacles" the following is being identified :

Miosic: " if someone has got trauma it is hard to come out of it. It is hard to carry on with the life if it is based on something bad that happened to oneself. And the traumas are huge. And then it is normal that the bad things are rooted in the person and that they draw their opinions from the bad things that had happened to them. "

Matulic: " It seems to me that people, alone, face the past very badly especially if it is a traumatized person, if it is a negative one, badly evaluated, that is - it was not positively evaluated. People cannot deal with the events that occurred in a proper way, and that does not go in their favour. About themselves and the group they identify with, and in this case it is the national community. And the national community was involved in the war circumstances, and the war is evaluated as a negative one. And of course that the society is not facing with something that was evaluated as negative. Who wants to do bad things?! It is easy to be a victim.

I had experiences with some people; when you touch a story connected to the war, they then become even more closed. And say - do not talk about it, I am very emotional, when one talks about it". I come to the conclusion that he is aware that he is under the influence of the emotions, and aware that the right mind has been affected, but further on nothing happens to come to a certain change. OK. Now I am going to cool off my emotions and then we will see." There is no position like that but - Please let's not talk about it" That makes me restless and even that they change their attitude/position, of course, there would be changes obvious for the society, but they probably do not see any specific gain that they might have from that.

There is no more war, there is relatively a normal life and why should they change some structures in their heads and invest effort in changing oneself, if the life is relatively good today. I think that they do not see any gain in facing the past and to go into that process and change some things. I see the gain within myself and with them, as they are around me, and I think that it would be better for all, at least a tiny bit better. But - they do not see that."

3. Combination of objective and subjective obstacles; (it is hard to be an individual in the group which is not ready to talk about it; there is a lack of readiness and courage for facing - in the NGO sector; there are individuals who are willing to work on the research on the past, particularly its multiplicity, but there is far too little of the multiplicity for the realistic picture to gain an important place and reach the majority of the citizens -

Vojko Ivica: " We must say something that was recognizable before, at the beginning of our work, that in the individual communication we experience that the people understand us, that they admire what you are doing, that they are for the peace-making, that they are for the together coexisting etc., however, when they go back to their communities, they transform, and if one was listening from the side, one would not believe that one was talking to the same person, which does not mean that they do not think exactly the way they tell us, but in one own community - one wants to identify with it;

K. Sukic: " my way of facing with the past clashes with the national correct one, national affirmative one. I have the feeling that there was a space

created for those whose story is special, personal and does not care whether the story would fit in some already given forms of collective memory and collective process of facing with the past. It is more problematic because we are compelled by the dictate of the national history. I think that the question of facing with the past is deep, and the question of the Croatian people facing with their own identity, there are many layers, from the emotional- psychological identity to the highly reflexive - political. Where the threats to a free discussions, resistance to uncontrolled discussions, uncontrolled facing with the past, facing the national identity, all these are the most complex.

Although almost all interviewees named obstacles on the general level, many realize also the specifics in different regions of Croatia in which they work.

Kursiljo: 'It depends in which part of Croatia. There is one way of looking at the past in Istria, where I was born, and different one in Slavonia, Lika or other parts of Croatia. We must go back to the WWII. On the one side, there were partisans, and on the other, Ustasa. We in Istria did not have Ustasas, therefore, we look at the thing completely differently - differently than where the people fought one another.'

Igor and Mirjana Galo point out the specific example of Lika, where are unresolved past and fears that come out of it. Things come out of "old boxes" that Croatians were killed there in WWII, that is was a revenge of the Serbs back then, and now the partisans were not the liberators but hoards of Serbs-cetniks, which cleared Udbina of Croatians, who were there the majority of population. Now in some way, now, we have the revanchism and return to the old. There is not enough cool heads on either side.

Readiness to sit down at the table and talk about it does not exist. In that part systematically someone keep stirring problems. It is like someone does not allow things to settle down. The people with clear heads do not get to come through.

The interviewees state that the lack of political will for facing and looking for a realistic look into the past is in the same way present today with the so called coalition government as it was then with the HDZ government. The big taboo in Croatian public, when it concerns facing the recent past is the character of the military/political intervention of the Croatian State in Bosnia. Besides - negating the aggression of Croatia on BiH in this case, the statement is also excluded from the public discourse, there is also some other subjects which is also not talked about. One of it is the number of Croatian soldiers fallen/died in Bosnia, but that cannot be told publicly. Because that would make us the aggressors. Someone has always been manipulating this and therefore affects the public and the way people think, on their fears, fuelling the hatred affecting/influencing everything that can rise out of it. (Galo)

The number of people missing is being manipulated with, missing in WWII and this war, but even with the real events in Gospic, Vukovar, Pakrac, Pakracka Poljana, what really happened in Dubrovnik, Zadar, Sibenik.

Galo: " what did covering the cultural monuments mean, for eg, those antic monuments, especially those valuable under the patronage of UNESCO. What kind of 'performance' was that?! One cannot misuse the hospital for hiding soldiers.

Like those who make those public talks impossible and reaching the truth. Mirjana and Igor Galo identify a lot of it and the manipulations: *"they are today respectable citizens and live like untouchables. To me, at the beginning, the journalists have killed more people than bullets. The public became non-functional because the consensus of interest was made between the politicians, clergy and soldiers, who do not make the facing/dealing with the past possible."*

Milo Bogovic, bishop of Lika-Senj, calls on a mass the Croatian authority, how could it accuse Norac and the heroes who had saved Gospic. He never looked or talked about the Serb part of Gospic, which was totally demolished, not bombed, but systematically destroyed by planted explosives, and people killed.

Question like these have been asked: were there camps for training set in Australia, Austria, Canada and America. About sabotage groups and specialists, who have organized terrorist actions - all those questions would be answered to get a real picture -how was this country created, was it by the democratic will of the people or was that a real "coup d'etat". When the institutions like the institutions of authority, - church, the public sector, schools, therefore the educational system, consciously obstruct facing with the past, turn the facing in some other direction, then for the individuals and groups who would want to work on it in a correct way, would lack the space.

Many, or even all stated factors of obstruction of facing with the past mostly work together, the majority of interviewed thought:"

Pilsel: "The social climate which was created does not suit the discussion about those questions, information-editorial mess in Croatian national television (HRT), bad editorial team in daily newspapers, lack of interest of the leadership of the Catholic Church, and other religious communities (catholic bishops have even refused sincere facing with the very important questions while "repenting' in the jubilee year for the sins of the past)

Ponos: "The obstacle can be the daily politics, can be some old positions, and the big obstacle in all this can be conformism of course. We should not forget and the fact that we live in a country in which there is no public in a classical sense. So we today live "a good deal live in a society some call it " big silence of a quiet majority", some call it " the domobran mentality", and I would like to call them people who do not care.
K. Sukic: "the situation that happened in Croatia after the third war in the last hundred years that state of the official, the widely accepted, widely distributed approach to the past is held through the mechanism of education, mass media's supposed facing with the past. And that state comforts of explicit forbidden state or explicitly forced one. We are not a democratic community, because it, I presume, every opinion treats from the start equally so long till it shows, incapable, ignorant, intolerant. But it should not be condemned, because of its presumptions, which in the start do not suit the authoritarian presumptions, be condemned as less worthy, even less fall under the forbidden state, that is if you are a heretic, outcast or nationalistic traitor"

II.6. Who they think should be involved in the processes of facing with the past?

The interviewed differ 3 basic levels, which would be the carriers of facing with the past

1. The government, that is so called state or official level, which would involve institutions in the State jurisdiction, from the Government and courts to Universities.
2. Civil society, which is also widely defined in the spectrum of NGOs to independent experts, researches, and media
3. International community

Although the majority thinks that in the process of facing should participate the governmental and organizational civilian society, they differ it so - to which levels should have the priority, and some of the interviewees find that the so called official, that is the governmental level should not be participating in the facing, of rather should not be the initiator. In any case, almost everyone agree, if the official level would be include, because it can play an important role, the process itself must happen besides the political interests of the governmental structures, or any individual interests. The interviewed also have the different opinion - whether the process of facing should start individually, that is from the individual or should it firstly be public, political-social process.

Terselic: "I think at this moment, the priority is the research of the factual state and that is the responsibility of all as well as the journalists, and the police, and the judicial system. And the civilian initiatives and all professionals should somewhere work off their share of work concerning the interpretation and emphasizing stories. I think that the Croatian judicial system should be able to process the suspects who will not be processed by the Hague.

I. Miosic: "Facing the past must not be a political must. The carrier of the "facing" must not be the government, governmental organization through governmental programs that must happen somehow out of the institutions somehow more spontaneous, when the time is ripe for it. When it is still forced on people, they will have resistance. I see the facing firstly as my very personal thing.."

K. Sukic: "Potentially, I do not exclude anyone, and I hope that all can and need to be part of the facing with the past - I could only mention that, some segments of society for now have in it, showed the bigger openness, less fear, bigger receiving the facing with the past first hand in reality. I think of all those who are ready and capable of taking over and certain risks, which follow from facing with the past, and that is a risk of taking the pain, which that facing can start off. To me, personally, for the facing with the reality, in far were people who had theoretically ambitions and therefore a certain theoretical status in the society, those who have thought the reality in its

widest and deepest meaning as the historical, as the epochal reality. That in Croatia, in great number are - the political- theoretical workers such as Zarko Puhovski, Ivan Prpic, Ivan Paden, Nenad Zakosek, Srdan Dvornik. Then people I have met within the antiwar movements, people with whom I meet on a daily basis, with what in Croatian past is hard to carry that is unbearable. People who have recognized the need of that alternative, unofficial facing with the past, those who are least subjected to control, those who actually want the facing with the past, which will not be directed or ordered or subjected control and therefore the manipulation."

~K. Kruhonja : "I would like if it could be brought to awareness that the facing or releasing of the past is important to public interest and then to include the government institutions, parliament, social institutions, professions, definitely the historians - those probably, the push and the inspiration should come from the civilian society, from the individual, the intellectual, of course, the church would have an important role. But that comes to mind as the last thing. It is hard that someone inside of Catholic Church can start the process of change. Despite that, the church is an important player."

There are, of course, opinions, to have an easier process and more relevant one, when there would be a governmental, official instance, for e.g. paramental resolution and support to start the process of facing with the past. That kind of resolution would maybe help the certain masses of public in participating in the process. On the other hand, it is equally important to initiate the public by the organizations of the civil society which would then be able to influence the making of the paramental resolution."

Lalic: "Of course, that the influence of the government would be most important. It then decides on the educational system and has influence on the media."

Uzelac: "But those "up"- they could really change the situation. Rational politics, which would make qualitative jumps in the sense of the economical changes, because one should look at that too: how many production lines are open in Borovo, can the Croatians and Serbs work, because then they could talk- that's the basis."

Vojko Ivica: "the thing we are doing, what we want to do and where are we on the road to succeed, is that we work on the returning together with the governmental institutions. And that out of simple reasons that then we can clearly and loudly make sure who is the obstacle and what the obstacle is. And we are very close to accomplishing it. Of course, we would want it to be on the level of Croatia, and that it does not only manifest itself in the regions where some activists had some more courage or more of a wish to work together in that with the governmental institutions."

The participation of the political parties, however, has been as counterproductive and potentially manipulative. In the process itself, except already mentioned levels (governmental institutions, peace and human rights organizations, experts) the interviewed mention following 'players': returnees, defenders (soldiers), veterans, civilian sufferers and victims of war."

Uzelac: "people who participated in the war, those who really were in the war. There are many of those who would wish it was not connected with their privileges because those organizations who brought them together completely"

took over things into their hands, and people who really participated in the war now have not got jobs, whereas some other constantly get money and privileges -"

Matulic:"and with those who suffer from PTSD - the subject of facing with the past is a very important one. That is, for them this is the most important problem, because by definition they have a traumatized experience which had marked them and even today makes problems in everyday life."

Mjakovac: " some kind of diversity after all. Not to have trainers on watch, but some criteria, which will give diversity, and at the same time to have people who you can work with. Not to have mentors on the one side, and the other the beneficiaries. But let's have all groups - from the "main stream". The big role is given to the media. (the journalists, and not only them, and those "gate-keepers"- the owners of the newspapers, editors, it is especially important; But there is also to think about the little radio stations, local media, local radio stations- on which people talk, without a director, big scripts and scenarios, simply people talk about events they have experienced and who wants to listen, listens and can come and start a dialog with what he/she had heard and tell their own story ."

Ponos:"That's not the question whether some media is full of politics or not, whether it is under influence of this or that politics or business group, but it is a question of seriousness or not being serious. If we talk about weekly magazines, then one should have in mind that in this moment, in my opinion, in Croatia there is no good weekly magazine. So, there should be an open space for some other serious weekly magazine, which will be hard, and let me not go into the reasons "why". If we talk about the television, then one should have in mind that there is no media pluralism. Ten years ago we, could as a society, hear awful lot of stories about the necessity of freedom of media and independence of journalists, but very little about the media pluralism. For a democratic society - the media pluralism is by far more important. Television is the most powerful media, but there is no pluralism, it has not got no alternative, no competition. And the church, which potentially, has the biggest influence on the field of civil society; by its structure and its mission should have motivation to have some things dealt with and to start talking about it, and I think, that it is very influential in Croatia, that the church would have some credibility.

Kursiljo:"I think the church in the first place, and politics should learn from the church. I come from Bosnia and Herzegovina, and I know what was happening there, if it had not bee for the faith - I think that it should be an ecumenical approach and politicians should be invited to learn from the church, because the church is the first who brings the program of forgiveness and peace."

Scientific disciplines, which did not do much in their domain: I think about sociology, political science, psychology and all others which did not do much. Maybe I am wrong. Maybe there were some studies about the war, about the conflicts, about what happened under the influence of the war. Every reasonable scientist, presumes that there is two sides necessary for the conflict, that two sides are involved, but even then you do not have the situation to, in a subtle way, see the whole story that was taking place. I

expect from the church and science development of some values, and the authority should apply those values on the every day life (Matulic)

One selected, general opinion:

Tihomir Ponos: "And there is one further step, and they are called politicians and historians. Politicians are people who think in a more or less daily rhythm; they think about in the span of 4 years, the time they are in the "office", or 5 years, if someone was elected for five years, and that's the better, more positive variant. You cannot, therefore, expect much, but you can expect that in this or that way, they use the passed events in their political agenda, which can be ugly, but that's understandable. If, playing with the past helps win the elections, then they will play with it, and win the elections, because their main concern is to be in power, the position of authority. There is an entirely different problem with the historians. The historians are, by one definition, the artists of all artists. And the history is an art of all arts, because the real historians recreates the history, so. again, on the basis available documents, if we are talking about the contemporary history - testimonies, films, everything that's available; the historian creates it from the beginning. So, he/she does not reconstruct it, but recreates it, bring to life again. Secondly, very often it is mentioned here by us is that the historian must be independent and not by in his/hers thinking, which putting the huge stone on the back of the profession. Something like that it is not asked for, of a sociologist, of a political person, of a physicist, of a biologist, but of a historian- yes. Historians are people, like everyone else, they have their views and very often their own views put into their historical books, and that by that they do not distort, do not falsify historical facts. That's the old story about the glass - half full -half empty. Secondly, I would not have a great trust in Croatian historians, although Croatia had a few really first class historians, and today there are some. Namely, one should not forget, we now expect them to give us the explanations of everything that had happened. Firstly, who has the right to ask from any profession to give us general explanation of something that had happened. One forgets that our historians have not come to agree to that, was Tomislav a king, or was he not a king. And that happened thousand years ago. So, the historians will, of course, do their job, they will write historical books, they will write bad ones, interesting ones; someone will write surely and one malicious article or a book with bad intent, someone will write a completely distorted interpretation of some historical events. Without any doubt, one should solve the question of war crimes and those who are responsible for them should be sectioned, in one right judicial procedure. It should not, as it usually stated here, sanction only the doers, but also those who gave orders, those who have covered up the crimes, and those who have inspired it.

That's a category, which had completely come off here, and which was very much present at the German process in 1945 and 1946. Firstly, the judicial system, which works on it. Good or bad, that's now another question. So there is the legislation first and it is certainly its jurisdiction, because it would be, by definition, it should have the highest authority. Now, we can open the problem of discussion about the state of Croatian judiciary

system, which is again a bit of a paradox. On the one hand, officially, none believes in Croatian judiciary system; it is constantly talked about how it is slow, lazy, inefficient, corrupt and so on. But at the same time, from year to year, the number of court cases rises. So, the story here is not black or white. So, from the institute for ethnology, sociology and so on, there is a lot of work for all. I would not put my faith into the politics.

When we talk about NGOs in Croatia, I have a fear - and that means that I am relatively familiar with state it is in - their sloppiness, the sloppiness of some people. Secondly, the exclusiveness. One of the biggest exclusiveness is that the creation civil society, that is that the organizations of civil society in Croatia tolerant. No, they are exclusive, in the same principle, in which HDZ was exclusive. Only that they have come with the national slogans, so it was said: "Who is a Croatian, can be a bad Croatian, therefore one is still good, and the NGOs have a slogan: 'We are very tolerant, especially if someone thinks the same as us. And as soon as someone does not think as us, we are still tolerant, but we will try to hide it.' Therefore, I am not some kind of optimist about the thing that NGOs can bring something to it, but with some serious exceptions, which comes down to 3 to 4 NGOs, like HHO, Centre for Peace, non-violence and human rights from Osijek and maybe two or three and others can actually do bad damage, because of the unprofessional people, their sloppiness - they read little, they accept positions that suit them, and which they have not checked. And this field is too fragile, to come bursting out with a position, which is not based on facts much. I am not an optimist like those who come from Croatia, whether it is from foreign countries, whether they are coming from international organ, which tell us what we need, we have to (must).... We have anyway, literally, two standards - one is not only for the Croatians on this territory, and some other, for some other part of ex Yugoslavia, and that's a fact. The court in the Hague did not send some documents for some cases that the court in Rijeka and the lawyers from Rijeka asked for. And that's it. It would be a different reaction if Croatia did not send the documents The Hague needed. Least to say that here we can complain saying - they have come to clean our yard, and they have not cleared up much in their yard." If we agree that the human right are a universal, then our politicians have the right to complain to the foreigners - why don't they clear up their back- yard.

III Activies directed towards Facing the past

The activists interviewed for this research alone have pointed out to the fact that do not know about the initiatives and action taken around the process of facing wit the past, except for those they have undertaken themselves and even those were rarely done, especially with the direct intent to work on facing the past.

K.Kruhonja: *"in the project for Vukovar and Pakrac- we suggest, as the first step, and I see that you are doing it as well, gather people, who are interested in the subject, and who work on it so that we could think through together where we stand and how we could go further. To see what questions*

are essential, what obstacles there are, which are the possibilities, approaches - to find common ground, support and organising (even for a short while - around a local project)

Lalic: 'it is common from some people as individuals, so the group has difficulty in accepting them, in the beginning - but later it gets to be normal. Here - the break point came from some courageous journalists who first talked openly about some things that others were not allowed. Very important was the discussion of some politicians - the role of Vesna Pusic, when she said that Croatia was the aggressor on Bosnia and Hercegovina. She suffered several blows but she had the strength on every new case she bounced back- it was also warned that they were some bad points from the Croatian history is weaker.

From Viktor Ivancic - in the Media, Vesna Terselic in the NGO sector, and Vesna Pusic- they are all cultural and political specialists who work on the hard ball of people not being willing to accept the process of facing with the past and that is typically human. Is it a typically human virtue, and when we compare the other nations of the ex-Yugoslavia - the Croatian citizens have shown more readiness for the process then the citizens of Serbia, for example.

We should thank those individuals and their courageousness, those who have done a lot of work and, so it is normal to talk about it now. The number of the tabu topics, and tabu-people is coming down. There is of course the doings of the court in The Hague and if there was not anything like that it would have to be made up. It maybe does not function as well as in Croatia as one direct mechanism, which would set the criteria.

It is definitely the people form the NGO sector. I would name some but there are very little of them - it is definitely some journalists - Globus-Nacional- although their writing and presenting is very scary. There is also some politicians, who contribute to the facing with the past. I have mentioned V.Pusic, but there is also other politicians who contribute to it, there is also historians. And there is also some influential intellectuals who work towards that process.

Maybe, Don Ivan Grubisic who has a weaker influence in the relation to his real political engagement, Mirjana Krizmanic. It means that there are some influential intellectuals, who as witnesses, people who work in universities as historians. I have, with some people, and that includes Rogosic Miro, in 1999 and 2000, organized the first arrival of one intellectual to Split and that was Ivan Copic. I would not say in any friendly manner - but colleague-like relationship. I have not seen him since then.

The only person from the public life and on the state level several have mentioned the president Stipe Mesic as someone as someone who approaches the subject of facing with the past systematically, responsibly, and correctly and he has done many steps forward towards that process. Some meetings of intellectuals are being mentioned, which were held in hte last ten years as some organization of the civil society - Center for Peace Osijek, CMS Zagreb, religious institutions or organizations close to the Church (CroPax, the Franciscan Peace Institute,, individuals like Bozo Vuleta from the Franciscan Institute for Peace, Zdenko Mardevic, sociologist of religion and follower of the Catholic Church , who published a booklet "The Peacemaker"

(Mirotvorac), Vice Batarelo- from Croatian Caritas, Boris Peterlin, Petra Pajdakovic, Ante Vucemilovic.

The individuals form the NGO sector: Vesna Terselic, Goran Bozicevic, Vesna Kesic.

It is a common impression that a small number of people and Institutes open the questions of the past, as if they are not at all connected with one another.

Katarina Kruhonja for the Center for Peace Osijek, describes their activities on that subject this way: " we work more on creating a space for dialog, talk about the 'injury", open the communication channel among ordinary people over the line of division that this war has caused, so they can be in the same room and slowly start opening/putting some questions. It seems like the direct facing with the past is not yet on the menu - first to stop putting everything in the same basket, and have the personal communication channel open."

CMO (Center for Peace Osijek) is, for a long time, present in the region, in different ways, with the mission always towards recovering from the war, and the post-war 'reconstruction' of trust, at the same time, K. Kruhonja mentions the difficulties in those programs, where "as if we all the time step out over our own abilities (the safe space)". The Center for Peace Osijek has developed program, called "the touch of hope" (Dodir nade) which is directed to the work on the facing the past - injuries from the past- which came out of the war. We worked with two groups (each group of 15 people), the whole of the last year. It was pretty much successful, we had some fantastic changes with 2-3 ex-soldiers. However, I think that I could have done more, that I have approached it superficially, that I have not dared to go into the depth- I was not ready to lead them to the "margin of the possible". I was aware that they were ready to go deeper, but I did not dare to go there. Why? I was afraid that I would do some damage, that I would open something and would not know how further.

Surely, and because, I am alone, because we do not have enough space, time to prepare for that kind of work. Thirty of us work, through different projects, intensively with traumatized persons the last 5-10 years - we do not have (and we never had) a systematic supervision! We work with a load of other commitments, and activist kind of a way and for god's sake- you can not work in that way in this process of facing with the past.

"The touch of hope" has started through the project of "The shared bench"- when one Mennonite priest from England, who earlier worked on joining the churches of the West and the East six years previously, came to Osijek. In the beginning it was a program called 'break from the war'- the group of 12 persons who were from the war zone (the zone which was under the Serb control or on the Croatian side)- they went, with very little preparation (one or two half day prep workshops) to England for 10 days. There, they had somewhat more intensive seminars in Barn Close- Centre for Peacemaking: there- questions from the immediate war past were touched and opened- actually, the present- findings and experiences of war from both sides: how they have seen the war, how they perceive the guilt or responsibility of both sides and so on. " The touch of hope" - including the cycle of

workshops in Croatia - 6 workshops in the first half of the year that preceded the trip to England. Then the group stayed in England for 10 days. He now has a post in Beli Manastir. His name is Marjan Percinovic. The program in the field of "injury" and healing goes thorough the way of identifying and the identity of the "injury". We constantly build the group at the 'active listening' workshops, emphatic listening" among one another; the question of the source of inspiration and the strength for healing and generally, the relations toward the "injury"; we also talk about he question of forgiveness and peacemaking; the question of the injured healer - helper- how as the injured person can help someone else - that is the support that one gives to the other and shares.

Mirjana Mitrovic, Monika Simek, Ljubica Beric with a group of ex-soldiers from Okucani have worked two years on the programme "Trauma and Self-help" - facing with one owns emotions, stress, injuries but with the accent on non-violent communication within the group, the possibility of the dialog within the group- in relation to the past - and the future.

The participants were dressed in uniform- the results (changes) we got from the participants:"

1) the group lost its mistrust towards The Centre for Peace, NGOs and according to their perceptions, the so called "peace-makers"

2) they have signe out of the political parties, they have stopped being manipulated politically, like a lot of people in the political parties.

When the thing with Norac happened, their branches did not want to sign the petitions.

3)they work now (help, they are involved) in different activities in the communities where both the Serbs and the Croatians work. For example - they have helped to organize a Peace Camp for the youth in Okucani - there were young people from Bosnia and Serbia. One of them has suggested for example to disnsamble the bunker on the Sava river bank which is directed towards Bosnia and to do the same on the Bosnian side - that would be a demonstration of an antiwar will.

4) In their annual plan of activities they have included the program of recovering from the trauma

The Center for Peace is present in Berak since 1999. That is still a very difficult community, with a strong accent and influence of the nationalistic politicians, who manipulate the places suffered by the war. But there is also a small group of three people; although they are still at the beginning, their influence in the public life is big Dragica - returnee, Mile - a Serb who stayed in the village and Antun, who is and immigrant- a Croatian from Vojvodina. So in the public sector, composed team like that, I think, sends a message and speaks for itself. They organise meetings, which are attended by both Croats and Serbs.

In Okucani, we have still (we managed to continue the project) a Peace team who works very well (I have described the ex-soldiers,they support the cooperation of the religious groups; the result of their work is the local citizen's iniative with the diverse ethnic grouping called "Duga"; the Youth Forum). We have come to Okucani the first time after the military operation "Bljesak" (the storm)

We first opened a Human Rights Office, then started a program of visits

(Serbs who were dislocated from Okucani in the UNTAES-zone, we drove them to visit their homes in Okucani). After that - the Peace Team worked (almost 3 years, 26-27 months); and after a short break now works there again. Altogether seven years- keeping up!

K. Kruhonja:" we have a project called "horizon of peacemaking"- it is a dialog, which defines the perspectives of peacemaking in two concrete local communities - Pakrac and Vukovar. It is a local project, for the particular situation in those communities, because we find that Pakrac, and especially Vukovar, are some difficult "places". Vukovar as the symbol of suffering which does not overcome the symbol of peacemaking, but it is continuously a place of conflict, manipulations/difficulties, We have created that project (after long thinking and consulting with Vesna Terselic and the Pax Christi team from the Netherlands which works in Belgrade). They have even received fund for it. But, we have no strength to start it, we have not got the time to start it. That's one thing. Secondly, we have conducted interviews in focus groups of teachers, pupils and parents in divided schools in Vukovar. The university in Berkley, which has done the research works o the analysis of the material. The thing we have learnt from conducting the interviews is that the teachers clearly point out at the same time the feeling of being powerless and the need to do something about the separation of the schools, that the separation brings/leads to new problems. They do not get help or guidelines from the Ministry of Education, they do not know how to position themselves. They have shown the will to talk about it with their colleagues from the other programs (namely, the teachers do not communicate among one another).We would like to answer to that, use the moment and the will. Whether we are able to make it happen, I am not sure. Further, through the training for non-violence for the individuals from the religious communities, we will work on opening the dialog on the question of peace-building and the role of the "believers" in the peace-building, that is a project for the whole of the south-eastern Europe. Now they have made a basic training for Croatia. A project for Bosnia is being prepared. That is one place where we think that the question of the facing with the past would be opened. It is being financed by the World Union of the Churches."

IV How to face the past

IV 1. Some suggestions from the interviewees about how one should face the past.

To the question of how the facing with the past should look like, most interviewed emphasize the importance of open public and dialog and the need for a critic, dynamic and conflict process (provocation, aggravation) in the open public place: I would say that facing with the past does not mean black and white look at the past. Facing with the past is one dialog - the key is that we should treat tradition critically, which very much affects the life and positions and so is the basis for the dialog. I cannot have a dialog if I say that the partisans were right about everything, the same as, I cannot have a dialog with someone who thinks that Ustasas have done only good

things. (Drazen Lalic)

Kruno Sukic: "Simply, I find it necessary that our facing with the past must be a conflict, must be a discussion. I do not think, when I say that, about violent conflicts, in the contrary, the opposite the violent conflict, I think that that discussion -conflict can be taken from the conflict that of a physical nature. And I think, that making the facing the past lesser by stopping or making the different approaches of speech, interpretation of history impossible - they have, as it looks, helped that with the political silence, very simply nurture and spread the talk of the hatred. So, I would say that seriously, responsibly, facing with the past also must include courage to think independently, in way of research, beside the stream of dogma, even heretically.

But, as it was with the other subjects, the interviewees often emphasized importance of personal approach.

Uzelac: "I think that one should talk about the lives of living people, forme, that means that one should face with ones own life. When you say 'past', then you think all the time about the history, and in the approach to the whole thing - you should be avoiding the things that would put people off."

Matulic: 'I do not have a great opinion about big discussion groups, workshops and other. It can be positive and effective in some way but when it is to do with deeper things it is pretty ineffective, and people come, those who want to do it and have worked on many things that they should have. I am not sure how much that approach makes sense. I think that it needs to be worked with those who do not want to be worked with. I think that these groups represent the problem. The need for continuing approach is being emphasized:

Uzelac:" you open something, you have it like that and you leave - well, that can not go on like that.

If you give me 5 days but not only to me, but someone else, then ok, but you cannot bring people to start talking, and then it stops because the time has ran out. There you should be very careful., those talks have to carry on. They have to have some continuity, so that people know that they would meet 5 times.

Most often was emphasized the need for fine, complex, different, layered, sometimes and the "way around" - the sociologist, Drazen Lalic - states that the past which is connected to the Homeland war, one does not need to understand like one isolated social event, those events were connected with some other event - it is the violation of the independence of the media, slowing the process of democratisation, violation of human rights, fall of the earlier government, which was not only, irrational, but manipulative and thief-like. So, it is obvious that facing with the past needs to be approach slowly, because like everything else in life of some society, this is how you should see the context in which the certain action in this case facing with the past happens.

Uzelac: "to find the real relation or even dynamic relation between the terms like peace building, peace work, communication skills, non-violence, facing with the past - so that some things do not exclude

K. Kruhonja: 'we use the so called the instrumental peace-making, where you make the people to cooperate on something of a common use and common good. However, I hold as a key point, in the same time, not to take facing with the past lightly or completely close. One should listen and find ways that those subjects start openly and let go. Simple example from our history: my neighbour- one grandma says: my family were Ustasas and had been killed after WWI. In spite of everything, when Tito came, some "togetherness" - that kind of energy was felt. We went to rebuild the society, to the working brigades. And I remember that, how important it was to me, and good, many remember that" There is something like that. Facing with the past I see as a dialog - the search for the dialog - kind of a truth. However, if it is about working on trauma, and even if it worked on the preparation that we can face the past, then, it would be the first to do, I guess, facing with oneself. What am I in that situation? Where was I? Was I a victim? Where is my responsibility? Like for the ex-Yugoslavia, I think that we alone must face the question of the Ustasas. We work on many different projects. What they have in common is: a) proactive approach of including/working with the 'one side in the conflict' - there is always "the other side'; b) building of trust like an important part of the process; c) bring the awareness for the strategy of peace building through rebuilding of local communities (multi-ethnic local communities struck by the war- which we have brought to awareness, as a strategy in 1996). We look at the individual in the context of the community - and we look at the peace making as part of the community (that as a personal thing but or as a thing that stays on the level of privacy). Sometimes we get the support for a women's project, sometimes for working with the churches - we always approach it in a way as to share with the local communities; d) it doesn't matter about different projects (tactics), we want to influence the community.

Unfortunately the evaluation of things done, we see that we do not do things systematically, but sporadically.

We have worked with the group of ex-soldiers (defenders) from Okucani -for two years- the programme was "Trauma and self-help" - facing with ones own emotions, stress, injuries, but with an accent on non-violent communication within the group, possibility of dialog - within the group - in relations with the past and relation with the future. The participants were ex-soldiers (veterans) they came fully dressed in their uniforms. We have followed (seen) the results (changes) on the participants: 1) the group lost its mistrust towards the Centre for Peace, NGOs and their perceptions, so called "peace-makers" 2) they have signed out of the political parties - stopped being manipulated by the political parties and the politics. When the thing about Norac happened, their political branches did not want to sign the petitions. 3) now they work (help, they are included) on different actions in the community in which they are organised together, Serbs and Croatians.

Kondic:" we work with people from governmental organizations and NGOs and everything was done on the principle of balance, that means if there is a workshop, we have two facilitators, one Serb, the other Croatian. Everyone

must feel very, very safe. And we do not have to say that we came to 'make peace'. People come, because they live here, because they care for the community. There is also the part of work on the past. I do not want to call it "making peace" with the other side, but actually know that I will do it because she/he would not be there if it was not ready for it. But he/she finds it, probably, to say it aloud. Or that someone else puts it into a box of those who "make peace" and those who have given in. We often see that, although it is a short period, the same person cares about the other side, but they do not "make peace".

But the direct approach does not have to always be satisfactory: 'I think that the subject is being worked on, but that it only gets scratched upon. Some NGO organizes a seminar where it calls 10 Croatians and 10 Serbs and some 5 Immigrants from Bosnia and Herzegovina, and the subject is "let's start a project". They think by that, that they have contributed to the work, the fact that they have brought people together who have a joined, traumatized past, and before that they have not even talked to them. (Matulic)

Ivica V: "the thing that we see is that the peace-making is made to happen easily in the urban communities then in the rural ones. It means that certain inhabitants are isolated. It is important also to organize it so that these rural communities which are mostly very poorly informed, whether it is because of the work, commitments, the impossibility to find any kind of other information, they do not read daily newspapers or watch television. All our efforts, that we have been investing in for many years show that we come to a situation when we think that we have accomplished big results, and then, many times we find ourselves in the situation that we are at the beginning. Which does not mean that it was not good, but that the work maybe was not represented enough, maybe it was, sort of, in some narrow frame of work, there was not enough approaches especially in the part that now try to talk about, and out there that is still the majority of the population

D. Lalic: "*I would never demand that I was told who is/was guilty for the war. But I would be ready for the projects and research, discussion and for it to be through concrete activities, business, being together. To organize some round table discussions, at which one would discuss who attacked whom, and who had committed the crime, the spirale of misunderstanding would only rise. What is essential, that is not facing with the past, but the dialog, projects and activities, must be based on interests. If it is based on altruism, that will be characteristic for only a small number of people.'* The importance of connecting and mutual actions are being underlined: some "means" with which we could think of mutual stronger activities, that through campaigns or support activities, "the citizenship documents", they are against the judicial State, but that we go with our strong campaigns which would be promoting bit by bit - these values which make the facing with the past. And there, different political views/parties could be present - the green party, women and peace workers, that we, together, make a politics of facing with the past - by a lot of "little political views" and activities - to close a circle.

Kursiljo: "*In the end it will be necessary and relevant on the world scale, learning about non-violence, conflict resolution, and communication. Those*

are part of the knowledge, which people do not have, nobody had taught them, and they are needed for everyday life. You must know how to communicate, communication became so complex, and we simply do not know the basic communication patterns. I think it should be done systematically, on the level of state politics.

Kondic: "with us, a lot of it goes from the negative examples, and when there is a negative model then that kind of behaviour overrules other. If we start going towards the positive things that happened, then we have the chance for it to become the model of behaviour that overrules, because, in general, everyone wants to be good. An example: I come into the post office, and there is one man, who was the defender of Vukovar, and he tells me, you know that we do not work anymore, but, well, we work for you. I say: 'what do you mean - for me?' And he says: 'well, you are the only person who has said something about us, the people from Vukovar, something positive, and it is not true that we cannot be with one another.' I say: 'you actually say that you can live with the Serbs?' And he says: 'well, we can, we work together, and do not worry about- the Day of Europe - everything will go well and there will be no incident."

And one warning to caution and gradation:

T. Ponos: "maybe what lacks is, I think that many would agree with me, a bit of a break - for all of it. One should not forget that some people had, just eight years ago, family members slaughtered and their property burnt down. Let's not go into – "which side did it happen from?" Maybe, one slower, but a more persistent rhythm would be good for it, because like this altogether, it can be seen as a "pull up in one go" - and it looks a bit impatient, because it is thought that it will happen over night - it will not, it will take a decade to work on it and it will never be resolved, I am pretty sure of it. The question is - will we as a society reach the level, so we can live peacefully, sleep peacefully, without social distress, which is transparent every time when a new indictment arrives from The Hague. That will never go through without emotional stress and trauma, but maybe, a slower and persistent rhythm would be better."

Possible wrong model of facing with the past, M. Skrabalo sees it in the trade business: "I see that as a major danger, that everything else becomes unimportant, because now the only thing we must focus on is the economical development, that kind of consciousness, that which is orientated on trade market."

IV.2. Relation- Regional - Local

Vojko Ivica: "If only one country of the ex-Yugoslavia works on facing, and the others do not, then it is the work of the Sisyphus. Only regionally we can at this moment, and in an organized manner, talk about success of the job. The regional approach is the only right way that every peace-making which would be done - does not end up being on the glass legs and that it does not depend on the matter of choice by choice."

I. Miosic: "I have not been on the border (Croatia- Montenegro) and if some dire need does not pull me there, I will never go. But, I must say the reason why I think so. They have not still resolved among themselves, that

it all had not happen in Croatia. I think that being friends, again re-establishing contact etc, closeness, the regional connection and so on, economy and everything that goes with it. But even the mutual work on the past, at least by the larger part of the population will be hard. I think that it is bringing the politicly motivated closer, that it is directed from/ by Europe, by the outside world, I think that it is, except in a economically small number of cases, people who are economically motivated, completely apologetically.

I hear that some kind of "a regime of borders has been opened"- so you can go across with only an ID, without a visa to Montenegro. That means that if there were some people, they were shooting at us, set fire, killed and now one should turn the page over, as if nothing ever happened. It bothers me, and I think that that opening of the borders is not something people wished for, those who live there, but something that came from a political side. Personally, I do not think that we would have some big economical gain or I do not know any other gain from it. I always have Germany on mind, after the WWII, where the "de-nazifying" was done, and when it was done, the rest of the world could accept the Germans and even they even got the forgiveness from the Jews. The idea of "the greater Serbia" did not witness defeat, not the recognition, nor does Serbia admit the total war defeat, nor moral defeat. so that it is still alive. I think that we are culturally and in the question of civilization always have been the West. So, I think, if it is the wish to establish some region which is called the Balkans, that it has to be somewhere east from Drina, and not on the border of Slovenia and Croatia. Absolutely, a non-regional approach. Because the regional approach puts us in a region, in which we, I look it from my perspective, urban - Dubrovnik - we do not belong in it. It is possible that some other regions in Croatia do not feel that big of a difference towards the territory of Serbia and Montenegro, so, the eastern part of Yugoslavia, but I think that I from my perspective, feel it. I had a friend in Belgrade, I know that he was a city-man, however, his friends were not all from the city- like mine were. There should be some time let for things to cool down a bit, to have things settle a bit. That the generation who was shooting grows old and so it cannot come here for summer holidays, well, then, have his son come over."

Kursiljo:"Only economics, trade, only that and nothing else. Cultural cooperation. One must start from somewhere, but not into any kind of region. Cooperation like with the neighbours. If you think about the region as "together", then it does not come into consideration. But, if you think of the regional cooperation, trade, economic and similar interests, then -yes."

T. Ponos:" The regional approach is relatively hard, because of the different dynamic within the three, four or five States, which we are talking about. We have Croatia, which slowly and very difficult is sorting itself out as a State and society. We have a State, which is called the community of Serbia and Montenegro, that nobody living knows about - how long will it last, and in it what shape, and we have the Protectorate of Bosnia and Herzegovina - But that does not mean that one should not cooperate with one another. Very often one must cooperate. Let's say, many times, because of some investigatory business - one must cooperate because of gathering of the

evidence. We have seen on trials in "Loire", how non-regional non-cooperation can be fatal because the witnesses stayed in Belgrade, or in Serbia, that he fears coming one or two days to Split, to which, probably, he will never come again, and he fears what will, because of what he would say in the court - what will be said in Belgrade. That gives out warnings - to the leadership of the regional cooperation. At least in Croatia one should keep in mind, that the cooperation is absolutely not wanted. If it is difficult to distribute books, it will be even more difficult for certain newspapers, which proves that someone sometime committed a war crime. Not to mention the problem of the Archives, which after the fall of Yugoslavia stayed in Belgrade and which to Croatian historians were actually inaccessible- till recently. Therefore, the regional cooperation in any way, according to me, if it is possible in any way, based without any emotions, on a straight- forward interest. That's why it is not a miracle why the economy/trade is first to go. Even with the culture and the guest performances of Croatian theatres in Serbia or Montenegro. There is already problems, there, the talk about the rebuilding of Yugoslavia, although that State does not exist, it has even formally dissolved itself. The cooperation will go much easier on the private level as the principle, even at the trials, if some lawyer from Croatia knows well some lawyer from Serbia which can send him or bring some "minutes" or a document, and of course, the other way around."

K. Kruhonja: "when the regional approach is concerned, I think, that there is now people, who are ready enough to look, permit and let be asked the questions from the other side about one own position and ask openly questions to the "other side". These are "front men" and "frontline women" like Vesna Kesic, like you - Goran Bozicevic. Those, in my opinion, could make that step forward - face oneself in the mirror of the other one and be a mirror.

K. Sukic: "I was not, nor am, or work, in my way regionally, except if you do not count the rare or even more rare visits to Vojvodina, and not even that when I get the opportunity to hear from my colleagues, it does not show me that the simple communication within the region guarantees the making of our antiwar- civil society stronger. I still, actually, more than before, feel the need to question and base my identity, simply to - male, birth date, Croatian, European. And then base it on the communication, which is even wider than the regional. It seems to me that what we are at the moment - is the opposition towards the Bush politics. But I would say simply a socialist, civilized one. Therefore the localization on a regional context holds some danger that it should be important only as a mode, and, I think it is important only as a field of work, activity, only as a field of problems."

D. Lalic: 'I am interested in the events in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Serbia; and I contact people, but not enough. I personally did not receive any request, nor suggestion to write an article for a Serbian magazine, no did the magazines where I was the editor, initiated a subject, which would initiate this kind of cooperation. Something was published, but I am talking about the scientific cooperation, where this is not stimulated. I have worked with Slovenians, and with Bosnians, but with Serbs- not. The cooperation between ex-Yugoslavian countries should firstly be in science, media and similar areas - that would be a test to connect Croatia with other

countries. Because, if we cannot cooperate with those countries, then we cannot cooperate with those with whom we have not got a common language, culture, past and so on. I think that the regional thoughts are just coming to the mind, and that it will naturally and that Croatia is god given to be decentralised and regionally organized, and, at the moment, it is pretty centralised and focus is on the cities. A spontaneous process will strengthen the region, which now is strengthen in a bad way (conflict of the football supporters). Europe is Europe- region, and not Europe-State, and Croatia also will connect with the other countries of the ex-Yugoslavia, maybe more on the regional basis, than, because of something else. When the first couple of years, Serb tourists start coming to Dalmatia - the connecting will start. But how shall we talk about facing with the past, when almost twelve years I cannot hear any Serbian songs on the Croatian radio- of any musician or any type if the music. The government did not create an atmosphere, did not create conditions; it is the reign of stupidity, primitive way of thinking.”

IV.3. Positions about the relation of committees for truth and reconciliation and courts

One of the main problems in facing with the past is the relation of the so-called committees for truth and reconciliation and courts (the court in The Hague). Although the question was not directly asked, some interviewees have referred to it, thinking of the connection between the process of facing with the past - the question of justice, peacemaking and normalisation. The Question is problematic, since the court process of defining the guilt for war crimes in countries of ex-Yugoslavia has started, and it is at the same time a certain way of facing with the past because it puts the question of guilt and responsibility, independently from existing court trials in The Hague. That forces many questions because it involves two different ways of justice - restorative (committees) and retributive (criminal) justice, which can be incompatible (as for e.g. to decide who should stand trial in the court, and who should go before the committee for the peace-making?)

Some other questions are being asked: how, after the work of the courts in The Hague finish, how to open the national court cases - what relations to put between the different national judicial systems. Different processes of the facing with the past that are different form the court ones, if the trials are in process on the local level and regional level etc.

The interviewees answer the following on the subject of the justice of restoration and retribution:

Terselic: " Procedure in the court looks designed so it looks like a rare event, and I think that actually - penance has a healing quality. The case of Dinko Sakic, we can see what the problem would be if the retribution approach of the facing with the past- he is in prison, but has not repented, nor did his confession, which did not happen, had any effect on the healing. Namely, it is very rare that the suspect, even if there are numerous

material pieces of evidence - witness testimonies, really accepts and confesses to the committed crime and repent. And for the survivors it is very important to see on the one hand, the person who committed the crime take responsibility for what he had done, and on the other hand, that he is feeling sorry."

Different direction is the restorative one. In it - one tries to rebuild and reach peacemaking, at least the basic communication link. I think that the first step is the communication, where you really talk about what had happened.

Additional, contradictory situation is that, Tadjman had tried to work on making-peace, and for the case of mixing up the bones in the graves in Jasenovac - of the Ustasa and "Domobrani"- that does not lead to success - when different steps are being suggested in the restorative way of establishing communication - then there is enough to remind some people that Tadjman pushed them to the peace-making. For me the word peacemaking is not something I like to use often. I believe that it is a deep, personal process, which if someone feels, has reached the peace- making, that it is something very valuable, and I do not see that it should be talked about it in the public. It is very important that things, for the sake of this Homeland war, are done in the court, to have it processed and that the stories are kept safe, that there is a trace of those people who had been killed, and the stories of those people who were in contact with them.

K. Kruhonja: *"What I have read, in the post-war or dictator regimes, facing with the past becomes possible when one was given the chance to be forgiven, or things will be forgotten. That kind of a chance does not yet exist: either you will go to The Hague (or a local court, which does not function) or nothing. There is no other option. As far as I know, the committees for truth and peacemaking make a position possible for saving the face - something is gained from taking part in it. I do not see a way to have any other option introduced (that interest would rise) because the discussion starts from "us- the victors" and the interpretation of war as the inevitable, defensive and justified one. There is no alternative to The Hague (and we, from the civilian scene of the society, were not against it, even more, we have agreed that processing of the crime was the key point)."*

T. Ponos: *"When one talks about different committees for internal peacemaking, or that kind of committees, that exist, in the South African Republic, Chile, those committees try to be of a moral consciousness, before anything. There is a reason why, but I have a certain "holding back" position, because for anyone who wants to be a moral consciousness, because I take morality very personally. It is actually vital that they do not have a real function, only if the judiciary system does not function, they then might have the judicial function - in the case of giving amnesty. And yet giving amnesty is a work of the law, and not a job of a committee for truth, peacemaking and something similar to that."*

The question of the State, Government and governmental institution is problematic in starting the committees for truth and peace-making:

K. Kruhonja: *"A very little number of people involved, from the Parliament and Government, have supported it, but exclusively as the mission and task of*

the civilian society. Moreover, I cannot see how the Committees would function, especially if they are to be run by the governmental institutions. In other words, if you'd wish the Parliament to bring a resolution about it, then it should take first a serious preparatory work, probably from the level of the civil society, those who think things through, have an awareness about the need and motivation to work on facing with the past."

There are suggestions about how to involve the already existing "The Hague process" in the regional and local processes of facing with the past."

T. Ponos: *"I think that the trials in The Hague can be turned into a part of a catharsis, and that it would be worth the while to write a project, where the data presented in The Hague would be summarized, as a valuable data - and then to have it shown on the television as summarisation of the indictments and what had been happening. The understanding of one another is the integral part of the story about peacemaking and judgment making. And that is why it would be worth to use The Hague and those facts as a part of the argumentation about what had been happening and systematically present them and the experiences of many to simply put it to function for facing with the past."*

V. What kind of support system is needed for the process of facing with the past?

K. Sukic: *"the needs are great, insatiable, and therefore many different types of help are needed. It is very important to have the contact with the international community, not as a cure for prejudice of self-sufficiency, but an opportunity to learn on the mistakes of others, but also other people's achievements, suggestions and models."*

K. Kruhoja: *"The facing with the past cannot be and should not be done in the way of the frontline activism. There should be a lot of time for preparation, that the care and investment in reality does not take so much energy. There should be support for those who work on it - briefings, supervision, questioning among one another, and evaluation. I think that we, here in Centre for Peace and around it, have enough potential capacity. A lot of people (especially women) who have worked in the field, they have worked with the people, have been put out there, they have familiarised themselves with the subject, in those dangerous spheres, so - the more targeted or well judged, help - it would empower them and make them ready. Maybe those training sessions should have structure, supervision, creating a long-term strategy and long-term programs - to have a clear goal to where our little steps would lead - there should be "signes put up along the road".*

I think that it would be useful to use the experience which people gathered, those, who have worked in the field and who have worked in different ways. Maybe to get out of us the knowledge we have gained, in a structural way (and maybe we are not even aware of what we have learned). That would help us too, to have gathered experience put in theory, and help us exchange with other gathered experiences - outside and within Croatia. We do not have a clear long-term strategy on the field of facing with the past.

Kondic: *"The knowledge exists, but the support on the psychological mentor level, supervision in groups or organizational system of support, that what*

has been heard or already know or have read in some book to actually use it, live it - that does not exist. I think that we have good people, but these people should have care. Because these people have worked for a long time and they are very alone in it.

I think there is now a lot of NGOs established, and now we need to connect with one another. In my organization, we have come to the conclusion that we need to share the experience, thoughts, to sit down with someone, to hear what happened somewhere else because then it is easier to go over something that had happened to you, no matter what level it was on."

K. Kruhonja : 'It is important to get the thoughts of all together, all experiences and try the exchange, see where we stand , how efficiently we can go further - or to convince ourselves that the way we work now is good, good enough and according to the resources we have now.'

Lalic: " The civilian initiatives have the power, ideas, I think that they know how to make good programmes, the people from the NGO sector are enthusiasts, who do not ask for much, but still- the money is needed. I think that one cannot expect money from the State, although every one of those projects are worth the money, and there is a little possibility that someone will commit fraud and that the money will not be spent properly. There is many way and levels that need to be established. We can maybe establish the dialog with the past in a declarative level, which can turn to be a dialog of the lonely ones. I think that some foreign help should be called for, but not to treat us like the natives, - in the sense - we know but we do not have the state resources for it - but as experts. That is why those who give the money and who work in the non-governmental organizations are important. "

Uzelac: "You must have material means, but there is also the spiritual support. For e.g. the Quakers- they mean something to me. Maybe they do not mean something to the local people, but to someone else they do mean something. So, the support from someone, who you trust, the one, who empowers you spiritually. I am not really sure whether we need support from the political side or the media, that support would only be necessary if they would take part in it, and not just to give an abstract kind of support in words, because it considered that once the politician is talking good about you - your reputation is not good anymore. In the media, the methodology of the dialog should be put forward. "

Vojko Ivica: " The wishes and the making something out of them - are two separate things. We can talk more about what has not been done and that there was also a will from the international community, but there was never a real help in that sense. I would like to mention Kosovo, in a very short time, a large number of people left their homes and fled - but when there is a political will of the international community- 100% of the refugees have returned. That is not the case in our country. The big resources are in the NGO sector. The financial and the educational support are needed. It is connected. Education is needed on the levels of - learning how to use the e-mail system, making leaflets, brochures organizing discussion groups, round tables, especially the public discussion groups, which are direct. The round table - is where a certain group of

people meet, like - experts, scientists, mixed with the members of NGOs, so certain things can be organized. The returnees and people who should work on the peace making are being left out. One should organize meetings, visits, organize meeting of schools. There is room for all, because there are no obstacles there and you do not dare do something. The idea should be up there and one should make a strategy and go in it and make it work. Pilsel: "The needed is the support of the Council of Europe, Pact for stability, some Embassies., the Office of the President of the Republic, Universities, religious communities. One should establish organizations with powerful names, which will be funded by the international institutions, and although it sounds impossible to accomplished. The people who have been working in the field should be promoted and rewarded."

Ponoc: "I would start from this point- what kind of support would not be right - the political support, which today is strong - and tomorrow might not be. Support, by some with influence - media support would be welcomed, which one cannot in this moment expect, concerning the state of the media in Croatia, where it is actually better than 4-3 years ago, but that does not mean that it is good. In this case we are talking about serious subjects that need serious approach, and that is what is generally lacking in our media. The best support can be summarised in two words - if you ask me - "don't disturb". So, people, who wish to work on it should be left to do so, without disturbing them, but those people must be aware of the fact that the result of their work will be in public eye, and therefore, and be criticised. If you disturb them, and that was seen in the passed years, that people who work and try to achieve something, always get to be received badly because there is always someone who knows what the result would be and there I do not see the best chance given. But if a consensus would be agreed on, which will not be agreed on, but that does not mean that I cannot lobby for it and which basically goes from " don't disturb" - then something can there be achieved."

VI Conclusions & Recommendations

The 20 conducted interviews and two focus groups in Croatia on the subject of facing with the past in the countries of the Ex-Yugoslavia and its analysis show several things which one can see clearly, is that there is no systematic, responsible, structured facing with the past in Croatia. But the interviewed have given knowledge that come from their own experiences and made a lot of things clearer when this subject is concerned.

The main conclusion could be that, although there is no awareness about the importance of the process of facing with the past in the public sector, the experts and activists in the NGO sector are very aware of the problems that would carry on existing if the process of facing with the past does not happen.

There are a lot of different opinions about how that process should look like and what period it should cover- but we find - the suggestion from one interviewee that the models of facing the past should depend on what one wants to accomplish - what target groups and what level of public life one wants to work on, the same as to define the need of a specified approach, depending on the target group, region and what period of the past the

project would involve. The interviewees differ two possible ways to approach the process: one is the personal approach- working with the individuals or smaller target groups, and the other approach of lobbying - that work should influence the change of positions of the public, decision makers (government institutions/administration, Parliament, local self-governing).

Everything that was stated - both levels are necessary, and should happen simultaneously, because it is equally important to work with traumatized individuals and the level of awareness in the public that influences the political spheres. Although many interviewees show a great deal of suspicion, when the governmental sector is concerned, there is awareness that, without their intervention and political will, the work would not be satisfactory nor have the long-term effect. Especially because the change of the attitudes/positions in the same part of the society (education, professionals, media, public) - these spheres are impossible to reach without their participation. The interviewed also do not feel confident that the governmental sector would carry out the process of facing with the past (establishing committees)- that the process would be conducted under the influence of the daily politics. Very interesting is that, in the opinion of the interviewed, the initiative and political pressure and the control of the process later, and that the process should be conducted by the independent civil society sector- that is facing with the past must be an independent process.

The interviewed, which we can consider to be experts in their field of work, also point out the danger of unskilled, superficial, unsystematic work, that is not continual - especially concerning the past, which would have more bad consequences than it would be desired.

The participants of this research point out the problem of financing, support and networking, within Croatia, regionally, even as some are suspicious about the regional cooperation.

Guidelines for Prospective QPSW Programme

1. Need for support for the individuals who work on the process/programme - facing with the past.

- a) education (advanced)
- b) supervision
- c) international contacts/meeting (Quakers)
- d) burn out prevention
- e) exchange of experiences
- f) finances
- g) reward-public valuation of the work (not necessarily only for this subject)
- h) connecting and communicating (networking)

2. Need of the QPSW work to be stable, systematic, constant, long-term (with active interest, involvement of local people as advisors, supporters involving them in the structure)

3. Need for introduction (basics!)

- a) to the subject
- b) terms

- c) who and what one is doing
- d) exchange of experiences
- e) theoretical points
- f) world experiences

4. Need to overcome the gap:

NGOs/Civil Initiatives vs. Organizations which were formed out of the Homeland War, and the religious groups

5. Work with the defenders (soldiers) support system for that program- work with the returnees, work in local communities, work with the victims of war

6. Inclusion of the art and artists in the peace work/facing with the past

7. Regional meetings of the peace workers- subject facing with the past -discussions- finding diversities and not common points

8. Promotion of positive examples in the public

9. Work on values, ethics of the peace work, especially 'in the field'

10. Need for structuring, connecting, publishing, documenting the Human Rights and peace activities in Croatia in the 90-ties

11. Dialog between Istria and Vojvodina

12. Stepping out of the NGO frame and openness towards the people who are not organized

13. Creating the space and conditions for experienced peace workers to do demanding work (eg with politicians)

b) Open public discussions without the limits who could be understood and implicit

14., Finding the creative approach outside the NGO cliché

15. Two levels of work -simultaneously - personal, with individuals, groups, and public- lobbying - both are 'priorities; especially in the public, the approach must be rational, grounded with facts.

16. Educating the public about the 'gain that they will receive from working on the past' (look at one paragraph in the analysis text) and about the basic terms concerning the past

Interviewees in Croatia

Zagreb:

1. Gordan Bodog
2. Suzana Kulović
3. Drago Pilsel
4. Tihomir Ponoš

5. Žarko Puhovski
 6. Ana i Otto Raffai
 7. Marina Škrabalo
 8. Vesna Teršelič
 9. Maja Uzelac
- Osijek:
10. Katarina Kruhonja
 11. Marijana Mitrović
 12. Kruno Sukić
- Bilje:
13. Gordana Stojanović
- Berak:
14. Dragica Aleksa
- Vukovar:
15. Biljana Kondić
- Karlovac :
16. Milan Medić
- Knin:
17. Ivo Matulić
 18. Boris Mijakovac
- Benkovac:
19. Nikola Vukas
- Split:
20. Vojko Ivica
 21. Dražen Lalić
- Dubrovnik:
22. Jelena Babić
 23. Igor Miošić
- Poreč:
24. Biserka i Mladen Momčinović
- Pula :
25. Mirjana i Igor Galo

Group Interviews:

26. Zadar: activists of Small Course – Kursiljo (Catholic Church movement)
 - i) Mirjana Dunatov
 - ii) Nebojša Gunjević
 - iii) Anton Ivančić
 - iv) Marko Kovačević
 - v) Anđelka Mandac
 - vi) Ankica Vidučić
 - vii) Marija Vuletić

27. Karlovac: activists and partners of Committee for Human Rights

- i) Ratko Dojčinović
- ii) Jelka Glumičić
- iii) Mirjana Granić
- iv) Jasminka Ivošević
- v) Martin Jendrašić
- vi) Đorđe Korkut
- vii) Đuro Milošević
- viii) Nada Radović
- ix) Tomo Rašić
- x) Franjo Vuković

ORGANISATIONS AND INSTITUTIONS INTERVIEWEES ARE COMING FROM:

1. Kulturno društvo «Aster», Dubrovnik
2. Altruist, Split
3. Centar za civilne inicijative, ured Vojnić
4. Centar za građanske inicijative, Poreč
5. Centar za mentalno zdravlje, Zagreb
6. Centar za mir, nenasilje i ljudska prava, Osijek
7. Centar za mirovne studije, Zagreb
8. Fakultet političkih znanosti, Zagreb
9. Glas – glasilo srpske zajednice u Hrvatskoj, (Karlovac)
10. HOMO, Pula
11. Hrvatski helsinški odbor za ljudska prava, Zagreb i Karlovac
12. Mali korak – Centar za kulturu mira i nenasilje, Zagreb
13. Mali tečaj – Kursiljo, Zadar
14. Novi List, Rijeka
15. Odbor za ljudska prava, Karlovac
16. Srpski demokratski forum, ured Benkovac
17. Sindikat zaposlenih u srednjim školama, (Dubrovnik)
18. Udruga antifašističkih boraca i antifašista grada Karlovca i Županije karlovačke
19. Udruženje za mir i ljudska prava «Baranja», Bilje
20. Vjesnik, Zagreb
21. Vukovarski institut za mirovna istraživanja i obrazovanje, Vukovar