



Universiteit Utrecht

Teaching about Perpetrators: Documents, Media, Representations

Utrecht University

September 10-12, 2015

WORKSHOP PROGRAM

ABSTRACTS

PARTICIPANTS



Utrecht University



WORKSHOP:

Teaching about Perpetrators: Documents, Media, Representations

Utrecht University, September 10-12, 2015

Location: A. W. de Grootkamer (Trans 8, Room 0.19)

The figure of the perpetrator occupies a paradoxical position in contemporary society, characterized by a constant oscillation between fascination, repugnance, demonization and, in some cases, sympathy. This moral uncertainty is difficult to reconcile with contemporary memory culture and commemorative practice, particularly with respect to the commemoration of state crimes, which depends on a clear distinction between victim and perpetrator. And yet, it is precisely this uncertainty that has the potential to open up new and productive avenues for dealing with the legacy of past atrocities. In this context, the figure of the perpetrator has taken center stage in a large number of recent cultural representations of the Holocaust, the Gulag, and other instances of political violence or genocide. These representations, in literature, film, theater, and at sites of memory, present a nuanced image of perpetratorship and question simplistic dichotomies of good and evil.

At the same time, the ambiguity and moral uncertainty surrounding the representation and reception of perpetrators in contemporary culture presents an opportunity and a challenge for teaching and learning about past atrocities. Indeed, there is a growing consensus that presenting perpetrators of mass crimes as monsters or psychopaths is ultimately counterproductive, as it obscures the social, political, historical, and cultural mechanisms that enable them and inhibits an understanding of their continued relevance for today. Conversely, a more nuanced depiction of perpetrators should not result in a relativization or justification of their crimes.

Workshop Program

Thursday, September 10, 2015

14.00 Welcome and Introductions

15.00-18.00 Session 1: Texts

Stephanie Bird (University College London)

Emma Bond (University of St Andrews)

Daria Mattingly (University of Cambridge)

19.00 Dinner

Friday, September 11

9.30-12.30 Session 2: Sites

Julia Sarbo (Anne Frank Huis, Amsterdam)

Cara Levey (University College Cork)

Susanne C. Knittel (Utrecht University)

12.30-14.00 Lunch

14.30-17.30 Session 3: Images

Uğur Ümit Üngör (Utrecht University)

Stéphanie Benzaquen-Gautier (Erasmus University Rotterdam)

Nena Močnik (University of Ljubljana)

Ingrid Lewis (Dublin City University)

Karina Hoření (Masaryk University, Brno and Institute for the Study of Totalitarian Regimes, Prague)

19.00 Dinner

Saturday, September 12

9.30-12.30 Session 4: Testimony

Sibylle Schmidt (Freie Universität Berlin)

Eva van Roekel (Utrecht University)

Kjell Anderson (Netherlands Institute for War, Holocaust and Genocide Studies)

12.30-14.00 Lunch and End of workshop

The Participants:

Kjell Anderson (Netherlands Institute for War, Holocaust and Genocide Studies)

My research and teaching on perpetrators is focused specifically on perpetrators of mass atrocities such as genocide. I take an interdisciplinary approach grounded in criminology but also incorporating other disciplines such as sociology, psychology, history, and political science. I focus particularly on perpetrator motivation and how this relates to transitional justice processes. I have predominately engaged in qualitative interview field research in conflict and post-conflict settings including Burundi, Rwanda, Uganda, Bosnia, Cambodia, India, and Bangladesh. I interviewed around 120 perpetrators of genocide and crimes against humanity in these countries, as well as twenty or so victims. These interviews form a substantial portion of the empirical research for my forthcoming book (*Killing Without Consequence*, Routledge, forthcoming 2016). I began this project with the intention of comparing different forms of collective violence (such as ethnic pogroms, crimes against humanity, and genocide) and gathering data on the motivation and patterns of violence among perpetrators. However, I soon realized that this research would be distorted by the distortions of the perpetrators themselves, their tendency (like the rest of us) to reframe and revise the moral context and moral agency of their acts of perpetration. This led me to shift my focus to these distortions themselves and to develop and integrated criminological theory explaining the role of the moral context in the perpetration of mass atrocities. More recently my focus has broadened to considering the implications of perpetrator moral choice and motivation for transitional justice and criminal justice. I am currently researching genocidal intent in the case of ISIS atrocities in Iraq, as well as the role of socio-legal analytical frameworks in determinations of genocidal intent. I am also considering the role of transitional justice in transforming (or reinforcing) perpetrator narratives with reference to the specific case of Bangladesh. My research drives my approach to teaching. In particular it has demonstrated the need for a nuanced approach to the question of perpetration. This approach emphasizes the uniqueness of genocidal violence but also its linkages to more universal social tendencies. These linkages, in particular, are useful in my attempts to ground my teaching about perpetrators with students – to relate the perpetration of extreme acts of violence to everyday processes.

Kjell Anderson is a social scientist and jurist focused on collective violence, in particular mass atrocities. He holds a doctorate in International Human Rights Law from the National University of Ireland, as well as an LLM in International Human Rights Law from Utrecht University, and MA and BA degrees in International Affairs (conflict studies) from Carleton University and the University of Saskatchewan, respectively. His work experience includes the National University of Ireland, National University of Rwanda, Hague Institute for Global Justice, Forum des Activistes Contre la Torture (FACT-Rwanda), and the Organization of American States. He has participated in Transitional Justice and International Criminal Justice training programs in South Africa, Morocco, and the United Arab Emirates, and been a visiting researcher at the University of the South Pacific (Fiji) and the West Bengal National University of Juridical Sciences (India). He is currently a researcher/lecturer at the Netherlands Institute for War, Holocaust and Genocide Studies, as well as a member of the Board of Directors of the Sentinel Project for Genocide Prevention and the Vice President of the International Association of Genocide Scholars.

Stéphanie Benzaquen-Gautier (Erasmus University Rotterdam)

The way images of Khmer Rouge crimes are disseminated and preserved worldwide changed dramatically from 1975 to the present day. So did the forms of identification these images offer to Cambodians and non-Cambodians alike. Understanding these changes is at the core of my PhD research project—exploring the dynamics of Khmer Rouge memory from the perspective of visual history. What role do images play in the social construction of Khmer Rouge memory? To what extent do images clarify shifts in the identity of stakeholders involved in memorializing Khmer Rouge atrocities? How do images of Khmer Rouge crimes relate to transformations on a larger scale in terms of memory culture, technologies, and geopolitics? The dissertation situates these questions in a transnational realm that emphasizes the interaction of Cambodians and foreigners in producing and circulating images of/related to Khmer Rouge atrocities. If Pol Pot's regime lasted 'only' three years, eight months, and twenty days, the history of the Khmer Rouge movement itself spans over more than half a century, from the World War II to the present day as the trial of top Khmer Rouge leaders continues stirring up controversies within Cambodian society and beyond. It involves many actors (colonizers and insurgents, capitalists and communists, civilians and military) from the Asia-Pacific area, Euro-America, the former Soviet bloc, and China. These different groups have been rewriting the Democratic Kampuchea past "to meet the needs of the present, asserting their legitimacy and moral authority" (Alexander Hinton, "Truth, Representation, and the Politics of Memory after Genocide," 2008).

Transnational dynamics of memory, far from being a new phenomenon emerging from global processes, reflect the ongoing interaction of Cambodians and foreigners since the demise of the Khmer Rouge regime. This interaction produced over the years a great variety of visual representations in terms of mediums, genres, and styles. I approach these materials through the concept of visual history, which I define as an open interdisciplinary structure for analyzing the documentary and performative functions of images. My research retraces through images the history of Khmer Rouge memory since the 1970s, identifying actors, phases, and narratives, with a focus on social processes rather than individual recollections. It tells the story over time of a selected set of images mediating Khmer Rouge crimes to the public in Cambodia and abroad. The dissertation examines photographs, documentary movies, magazines, posters, drawings, paintings, exhibitions, memorial sculptures and social/digital media. This range of documents makes it possible to assess how much the medium affects both the modalities of circulation of images and the formats of perception. The overall study follows a chronological order that explores the successive political environments (Cold War and post-Cold War) in which images of Khmer Rouge atrocities are created and interpreted. Inside each chapter, the analysis is diachronic. It considers both the original context of production and reception of the images studied, and the afterlife of these images as they are presented in new institutional, geographical, and cultural environments.

Stéphanie Benzaquen is an art historian and a PhD researcher at the Centre for Historical Culture, Erasmus University Rotterdam, Netherlands. She received master's and bachelor's degrees in art history from the Université La Sorbonne Paris I in 1997. She also works as curator and has organized exhibitions and projects in Israel, France, Germany, Central and Eastern Europe, Russia, and Thailand. She is a recipient of a Leon Milman Memorial Fellowship at the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum in Washington DC (2012), a recipient of a fellowship at the Stone Summer Theory Institute at the School of the Art Institute in Chicago, Illinois (2010), and was a researcher in the

Theory Department at Jan van Eyck Academie in the Netherlands (2004-2005). Recent publications include: "Looking at the West looking away? Khmer Rouge, western blindness, and documentary images," in *On Not Looking: The Paradox of Visual Culture*, edited by Frances Guerin (New York: Routledge, 2015); "Post, update, download: Social media and the future of Auschwitz remembrance," in *Auschwitz heute–dzisiaj–today* (Berlin: Hentrich and Hentrich, 2015); "Looking at the Tuol Sleng Museum of Genocidal Crimes, Cambodia, on Flickr and YouTube," *Media, Culture & Society* 36:6 (2014).

Stephanie Bird (University College London)

My interest in and work on perpetrators relates to three distinct but inter-related strands. First is my work on narrative ethics and the ways in which representing forms of abuse or perpetration can be understood to be ethical or not. Robert Musil's exploration on the relationship of ethics and aesthetics are of particular interest here, particularly in *Törleß*, where critics have long struggled with the apparent lack of moral condemnation of a protagonist complicit in torture as a boy. The novel is crucial in demonstrating how fiction can play a vital role in exploring perpetrators, their motivation and their self-representation precisely by eschewing conventional notions of morality and discourses of moral judgement – discourses that did not prevent the abuse in the first place.

The second is my interest in the overlap between fact and fiction: what can fiction add to the representation of historical atrocity? Crucially fiction is free to explore interiority, both on the part of victims and perpetrators. It is also free to do what it wishes with the facts. But given that fiction contributes to wider discourses and contributes to the cultural imaginary in a way that itself can influence how history is understood, this raises the question of whether there is a limit to its freedoms, particularly when it represents events that still have an impact on peoples' lives.

Finally I am concerned with the ways in which through fiction we are licensed to enjoy other peoples' pain and the infliction of pain on others. I am particularly interested in the relationship of comedy and suffering. Comedy is expressly concerned with pleasure, so what can be added to our understanding of historical trauma and the perpetration of violence if representations include comedy? Comedy as a mode of representation undermines resolution or congruity and frequently undermines redemptive modes of narration. This can be deemed problematic if comedy is not in the service of moral condemnation of perpetrators.

These strands come together in my recent work on Jonathan Littell's novel, *The Kindly Ones*. I argue that at the level of the narrator, of the intertext and through the use of comic devices, the novel invokes the language of tragedy and justice while staging its failure and offering a rejection of tragic catharsis and the notion that justice has been done. I am currently developing my ideas on the representation of perpetrators by looking at novels that feature a Nazi perpetrator who assumes the identity of a Jew in order to survive persecution. The novels are all fictional explorations of justice, resentment and forgiveness. This forms part of a much wider project on the representation of perpetration and complicity across Europe, involving Universities, memorial sites and school educationalists.

Stephanie Bird is Senior Lecturer in German at University College London. She has published on topics ranging from the interaction of fact and fiction in the biographical novel, the relationship of female and national identity, and the representation and ethics of shame. As Co-Investigator on the AHRC funded project 'The Reverberations of War' she has been working on a comparative study exploring the significance of the comical in German-language cultural representations of suffering. Her latest book, *Comedy and Trauma in Germany and Austria after 1945: The Inner Sider of Mourning*, analyses how the comical interrogates the expectations and ethics of representing suffering and trauma. It does so by integrating a critique of dominant paradigms, such as that of trauma and of victim identity. The study focuses on the work of Ingeborg Bachmann, Rainer Werner Fassbinder, W. G. Sebald, Volker Koepp, Reinhard Jirgl, Ruth Klüger, Edgar Hilsenrath and Jonathan Littell.

Emma Bond (University of St Andrews)

My most recent research has been into contemporary women writers with family origins from the Horn of Africa (such as Maaza Mengiste, Nadifa Mohamed and Igiaba Scego) and their role in re-opening a public debate around Italian colonialism, as well as current related attitudes to migration, race and racism. All three use a variety of public media to 'talk back' to silences about the Italian colonial mission in East Africa: fiction and non-fiction writing, debates, interviews and events, and social media. In a recent conference paper (*Laying Claim to History: Cultural Economies and the Public Debate over Italian Colonialism*), I argued that it is precisely the public nature of the dialogue between these writers and their works that allows for the re-insertion of the multiple stories of Italian colonialism into a wider global context.

In specific relation to the figure of the perpetrator, my next project will look at Mohamed's *Black Mamba Boy* (2010) as well as two novels to be published by Mengiste (*The Shadow King*) and Scego (*Adua*) this autumn, all of which portray subjects implicated in Italian colonial practices, including war crimes and other atrocities. Mengiste, for example, says the following about her inspiration for *The Shadow King*:

"I was looking at old photographs of Italian soldiers once, and I found this one photo of a soldier sitting in front of a tent. [...] He hasn't shaved in a little while. His hair is a bit messy. But his eyes looked so worn out and tired. Just tired. Like he just wants to go home. And I kept coming back to that and not knowing why. I kept writing all these Ethiopian characters, and I kept looking to him – that picture – and then I realized he was a character in the book."¹

I believe that this instinct to add fictionalized personal histories to representations of Fascist military and other colonizing figures will provide an interesting contribution to discussions in Utrecht, and the topic itself chimes well with the stated purposes of the workshop. I would welcome the opportunity to explore these issues in conversation with others working on the commemoration and cultural representation of perpetratorship, as well as looking at potential related pedagogical practices.

Emma Bond is a Lecturer in Italian and Comparative Literature at the University of St Andrews. She works mainly on the link between identity and space in cultural production, and specifically on border, migration and trans-national narratives. Some recent publications in this field include 'Towards a Trans-national Turn in Italian Studies?' (*Italian Studies* 69:3, November 2014), and the co-edited volumes *Il confine liquido: rapporti letterari e interculturali fra Italia e Albania* (with Daniele Comberiati), Nardò: Besa, 2012) and *Destination Italy: Representing Migration in Contemporary Media and Narrative* (with Guido Bonsaver and Federico Faloppa, Peter Lang, 2015). She is joint editor of the new Liverpool University Press series *Transnational Italian Cultures* (with Derek Duncan) and she is currently working on her second monograph, tentatively titled *Writing the Trans-national Body*.

¹ <http://www.northbynorthwestern.com/story/envisioning-good-and-evil-an-interview-with-maaza/> (accessed 27.07.15).

Karina Hoření (Masaryk University, Brno and Institute for The Study of Totalitarian Regimes, Prague)

The task of the Institute for the Study of Totalitarian Regimes is to inform the public about the criminal activities of state bodies both during the Nazi and the Communist period, but it has tended to reproduce a narrative about society sharply divided between perpetrators and victims. This narrative was dominant in all post-socialist transition countries and perpetrators were depicted mostly in terms of flat stereotypes.

This tendency made sense as a way to legitimize new democratic regimes and as a way of coming to terms with the past, but this black and white picture of the past doesn't fulfil the expectations of contemporary education. Students are confronted in their civic lives with a more complicated public memory and school should be a space for a reflection on this situation.

The Department of Education is following principles of multimediality and multiperspectivity. We use short movie clips (both period and contemporary) to illustrate various strategies and motivations of historical actors. Movies (together with other kinds of documents) are used in order to provide a reflexive space for critical discussion. These are not used as simple illustrations of a given thesis but should encourage students towards discussion—for example about why various artists depicted the „perpetrators“ in certain ways across different periods. Many movies also provide images of „perpetrators“ that are deconstructing and questioning traditional images or providing space for questions of the inner motivations and the complex social situation of individuals in the past. For the work with movies, a methodology of confrontation of several short clips is used so that several perspectives or personal stories can be constructed and discussed in the classroom.

Karina Hoření is a PhD. Student at the Department of Sociology of Masaryk University, Brno and lecturer at The Institute for The Study of Totalitarian Regimes (ISTR), a research institute that was established by the Czech government in 2007 to conduct research and inform the public about the criminal activities of the Communist regime in Czechoslovakia. She combines theoretical research in the area of cultural sociology and memory studies with work in the area of public history. She represents the Department of Education of ISTR whose main task is to provide teachers of history with educational materials and documents about modern Czech history.

Susanne C. Knittel (Utrecht University)

My research project, *Faces of Evil: The Figure of the Perpetrator in Contemporary Memory Culture* traces the figure of the perpetrator through post-1989 memory culture in Germany and Romania, where the joint legacies of Fascism and Communism render questions of perpetration and victimhood inherently ambiguous and complex. I analyse the role of perpetrators in literature, drama, film, and at sites of memory in order to elucidate how these cultures create narratives about their own history through which they negotiate questions of complicity and collaboration in order to ascribe or disavow guilt and responsibility. Through a comparative and interdisciplinary analysis of the figure of the perpetrator across different literary and visual media in these two countries I will shed new light on how questions of perpetratorship and collaboration influence the construction of cultural identity, both at the national level and within the broader framework of European memory.

The year 1989 marked the beginning of a large-scale re-evaluation of the past and the double legacies of Fascism and Communism in both countries. This coincided with a turn to *Alltagsgeschichte*, focusing on the embeddedness of state violence in people's everyday lives and troubling the separation between perpetrators and civilians, making questions of guilt and responsibility, and the nature of 'perpetration' more complex. The focus on daily life foregrounds a contrast between the engagement with the memory of Nazism and that of Communism, namely the recent emergence of nostalgic depictions of the GDR (so-called "Ostalgie") and Communist Romania. The relationship to the Communist past is further complicated by the memory of the Fascist regime that preceded it, and vice versa. The same people may have been victims under Fascism and perpetrators under Communism, or vice versa. In this context, questions of guilt, complicity, and resistance loom large, and it is precisely the irreducible complexity of assigning clear labels of victim or perpetrator that makes Romania an ideal case study alongside the two Germanys. I explore how one memory may serve as a prism through which to approach the other, and conversely may also act as a screen blocking an engagement with the other.

Susanne C. Knittel holds a PhD in Italian and Comparative Literature from Columbia University, New York, and has been Assistant Professor of Comparative Literature at Utrecht University since 2011. She is the author of *The Historical Uncanny: Disability, Ethnicity, and the Politics of Holocaust Memory* (Fordham UP, 2015), which explores the cultural mechanisms by which certain memories become inscribed into the heritage of a country or region while others are erased or forgotten. *The Historical Uncanny* is a comparative study of German and Italian post-WWII memory culture, with a particular focus on the memory of Nazi euthanasia in Germany and the memory of fascism and the German occupation in North-Eastern Italy. Other publications include 'Beyond Testimony: Nazi Euthanasia and the Field of Memory Studies', *The Holocaust in History and Memory*, vol. 5 (2012), and 'Borderline Memory Disorder: The Risiera di San Sabba and the Staging of Italian National Identity' in: *Death Tourism: Disaster Sites as Recreational Landscape*, edited by Brigitte Sion (2014).

Cara Levey (University College Cork)

Years after the end of brutal and repressive civil-military dictatorship in Argentina (1976-83) questions over how state repression should be addressed continue to haunt the urban landscape and trouble public conscience. My current research project which will be published as a monograph in late-2015 under the title *Fragile Memory, Shifting Impunity: Commemoration and Contestation in Post-Dictatorship Argentina and Uruguay*, explores the contestation to which a contrasting collection of sites of memory are subjected throughout their lifespans. These commemorative sites signal that, rather than draw a line under the past and promote closure of historical interpretations, mobilization around sites of violence or the creation of a memorial precipitates new debates and raises questions over the past and how it interpolates with the present. A major strand of this research is concerned with distinct types of commemorative initiatives, loosely categorized as sites of homage, sites of repression and sites of protest. For the workshop, I propose to focus on the role of the perpetrator and narratives about the perpetrator figure in a selection of case studies in the case of Argentina, considering these debates in relation to how the sites are understood, received and interpreted by a broader public (usually comprised of the post-dictatorship generation, uninitiated visitors and school and university groups), as well as their relationship to judicial proceedings (ongoing since the overturn of impunity laws in 2005) and courtrooms as the physical spaces in which perpetrators are being tried and investigated.

Sites of homage: In the late 1990s, in contexts of increasing societal mobilization vis-a-vis the recent past, Argentina witnessed local government and human rights activists working together to construct the first national memorials to each country's *detenidos-desaparecidos*. In 1997 in Buenos Aires the *Parque de la Memoria* [Memory Park] project began to shape. The project included a sculpture park, which was intended to house the *Monumento a las Víctimas del Terrorismo de Estado* [Monument to the Victims of State Terrorism], completed in 2007, which would name those killed and disappeared at the hands of the state. Although the initiative were focused on paying homage to the victims of state repression, the construction raised complex questions about how the context of their deaths and disappearance should be categorized, whether the perpetrators should be mentioned (as Young asks: "How does a state incorporate shame into its national memorial landscape?") or whether the memorials should be focused solely on the victims. Yet, in naming only the victims, there is a possibility that this will result in a schism between the victims and the historical context, which in turn has repercussions for what visitors (many of them school groups and foreign visitors) seeking to learn about the past may take away from the 'abstract' memorial.

The memorial contrasts with the sites of violence case studies, those which entail the (re)functionalization of actual sites of state repression and violence, in which national governments played a decisive role. In the case of Argentina, the chosen case study is that of the former detention centre run by the Argentine Navy, the ESMA: following years of indecision, stalemate, the threat of demolition and ongoing societal struggles to recover the site, in 2004, it was opened to the public for guided tours and cultural activities. The ESMA project is concerned with emphasizing the links to the past and ensuring that society does not forget, yet the post-2004 Similarly, whilst advocates of the ESMA project are keen to ensure that the past is collectively remembered and understood. Yet, immediate intervention in the space for memory was hampered by the obstructionist stance of the Navy, who had vacated only a small number of buildings by the end of 2004. Amidst protests from the human rights community that entering the site with the 'perpetrators' still there was tantamount

to reconciliation with the perpetrators, the project stalled until the Navy finally left in 2007. However, the controversy pointed to the pressing issue of the role (symbolic, practical and didactic) of the perpetrator in the site where repression took place. Remodelling has generally been eschewed in the ESMA in favour of 'preserving' the site's evidentiary potential, yet until very recently, intervention in the site has focussed on the victims, not the images of the perpetrators. However, if visitors are to fully understand what happened in the ESMA, is it necessary to refer to, describe, name and provide images of the perpetrators? Is it possible to do so without glorifying the crimes?

However, the faces of the perpetrators are precisely the focus of the final site under discussion, the *escrache*. This transitory site of memory emerged as part of a wave of renewed activism in the mid-1990s. Undertaken by H.I.J.O.S, the collective made up of children of the victims of state terrorism, the *escrache* took its cue from the *lack* of justice to date appearing first when justice for human rights crimes was obstructed by impunity laws in both countries. In the high-profile events, participants march to the house or workplace of those accused of human rights crimes (many of whom are lesser-known figures, are living under house arrest, or have benefitted from amnesty and impunity laws) and alert the neighbours and general public to the perpetrator living among them. Although the *escrache* has been an effective strategy to disseminate information about the past, particularly to the post-dictatorship generation, it has been the focus of significant controversy for encouraging revenge and undermining the work of the courts, in particular.

Although commemoration is often understood as focusing on the victims of repression, the case studies all play an important relationship to trials in which the perpetrator is under legal investigation, and in terms of what might be learned about the perpetrator specifically and the past more broadly.

Cara Levey is a Lecturer in Latin American Studies at University College Cork. Her main research area is human rights and memory in the Southern Cone and she has published a range of articles and is currently completing a monograph on cultural memory in Argentina and Uruguay. She holds a PhD from the University of Leeds and MA from the Institute for the Study of the Americas.

Ingrid Lewis (Dublin City University)

Part of my PhD thesis focuses on the representation of women as perpetrators and accomplices of crime during Nazism. The research maps out and analyses the different categories of cinematic women working within the Nazi apparatus: the guards and head overseers, the secretaries, and the medical personnel. Acknowledging the paucity of studies on the topic, my research examines the depiction of these women, highlighting the differences and similarities with their male counterparts. The research suggests that the absence of female figures seen working within the Nazi system goes hand in hand with their confinement to stereotyped roles. It is significant, therefore, to point out that, in the seventy years since the end of the war, Holocaust cinema has dramatically changed in terms of style and narrative strategies, but not in relation to the portrayal of female perpetrators. The findings indicate that, films tend to depict these women mainly using stereotypes of violent, ridiculous or sexually perverted behaviours. By comparison, the portrayal of male perpetrators is much more complex and exhibits a high variety of roles from zealots, desk murderers, to unwilling executioners and even benevolent Nazis. The research traces the roots of such gender-differentiated depictions of perpetrators in the patriarchal mechanisms of Holocaust cinema rather than in the general disinterest in women perpetrators. Finally, the research acknowledges a shift in the representation of female perpetrators, marked by two recent films: *Downfall* (2004) and *The Reader* (2008). These films offer more nuanced portrayals and challenge viewers to reflect upon and interrogate the ordinariness of female perpetrators during the Nazi regime. Overall, my research argues that films are much more than (re)presentations of history: they can function as important interventions in their own right, which challenge and re-interrogate collective memories of the past. This indicates not only a dynamic and fruitful relationship between film, history, gendered representations and cultural memory in Europe, but also enables us to consider the filmic medium as part of a broader platform that transcends national boundaries and on which discourses about the past are constantly revisited, challenged and reformulated.

Ingrid Lewis has recently completed her PhD in the School of Communications at Dublin City University, Ireland. Her thesis analyses the representation of women – as perpetrators, victims and resisters - in European Holocaust films. Her research interests are in the fields of Film Studies, Holocaust Studies, Perpetrator Studies and Memory Studies. She has presented papers in several conferences all over Europe. Ingrid Lewis is also one of the twelve international researchers chosen for the first EHRI (European Holocaust Research Infrastructure) summer school in Holocaust Studies held in July 2013 at the *Shoah Memorial* in Paris, France. In June 2015 she was one of the 25 fellows who attended the prestigious Summer Institute organised by the Holocaust Educational Foundation of Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois, United States. She is the author of 'Ordinary women' as *Perpetrators in European Holocaust Films* (2015) published by Palgrave Macmillan in the volume *Revisiting Holocaust Representation in the Post-Witness Era* edited by Tanja Schult and Diana Popescu.

Daria Mattingly (University of Cambridge)

My Ph.D project is an interdisciplinary examination of the identities, activities and memorial traces of the rank-and-file perpetrators of the 1932-33 famine in Ukraine, known as the Holodomor. While the perpetrators of the Stalinist Purges have recently become an object of enquiry, those who directly facilitated mass famine in this region have largely been neglected by scholars. Who were the perpetrators on the ground? How have they been remembered?

To answer such questions, I propose a methodology that incorporates a microhistorical analysis of the famine period with a close reading of memorial and cultural texts composed after the famine. I analyse the existing tropes in history writing, fiction and education. My study will challenge reductive 'lacrimogenetical' readings of the famine as well as prosopographical readings of its active participants as outcasts devoid of historical agency, contributing to the Holodomor Studies and Soviet and Ukrainian history more generally. My project draws on archival data, testimonies of both the perpetrators and the survivors of the famine, and 'post-memory' in three Ukrainian villages based on their citation in the memoirs of Soviet dissident Lev Kopelev who participated in the events. This microhistorical analysis seeks to cast what took place in the rest of the country in greater relief.

My pedagogical practice on the subject will take place during supervising of 6 students for SL12 Stalinist Russia 1917-1991 at Cambridge University during the year 2015/2016 including a lecture on collectivization. More details here: <http://www.mml.cam.ac.uk/sl12>

Having completed the second year of the PhD course in Slavonic Studies at University of Cambridge, **Daria Mattingly** is researching the ways people who facilitated the famine on the ground are remembered in Ukraine. She holds an MA in Russian History from Bristol University (UK) and an MA in Philosophy from Shevchenko University (Ukraine). Her publication on the subject is forthcoming in *Nationalities Papers*.

Nena Močnik (University of Ljubljana)

As a theatre of the oppressed (TO) practitioner, I was always concerned how the process of liberation in this pedagogical practice focuses on empowering victims or the oppressed only and thus, in most of the cases, we keep the positions of the oppressors-perpetrators untouched, unquestioned and somehow very determined and definite. Traditional practicing of TO does not question the oppressor beyond his ultimate non-reflective, oppressive role, and therefore implies the idea that the oppressed are the only ones who can change the current position and who must intervene to break the oppression down.

During this workshop, I want to open up a conversation about 'humanizing the oppressor' with the case of rape perpetrators in the Bosnian war. I believe that only if we look at the oppressors/perpetrators beyond their criminal role and ascribed evil characteristics, can we understand their actions better and build effective processes of forgiving and recovery. That does not mean, of course, that perpetrators' actions are to be justified or simply forgiven; rather, it goes in the direction of Paulo Freire's idea that we can only fight against further oppression if we know and understand the oppressor and his actions, not the oppressed.

Bringing in my academic background, I want to contribute to this workshop with some examples from my own pedagogical and therapeutic work with victims of rapes and sexual violence during the war in Bosnia-Herzegovina in the 1990s, and I particularly want to raise the question of the potential of sexual and love relationship between victims and oppressors, as well as consensual and sensible intimacy of rape perpetrators with their partners. I am interested to discuss with other participants the social representations that imply that perpetrators of rape are not capable of love and consensual sexual relationship and even more, the ideas of their perverse minds and/or perverted sexual ideas. I would like to bring in concrete cases of popular culture representations of perpetrators in BIH, where presenting them in a positive light with emotions and sensibilities, has caused some very hot and conflicting conversations; the 'humane' side of the rape perpetrator, his ability to love and sexual respect was unconditionally denied. Because of this, I want to discuss the need and the challenge of humanizing the rape perpetrators particularly in the context of their roles of 'loving fathers and partners' – is something like this imaginable? Is it realistic?

In this workshop, I would like to share my experiences of TO work in such a context and with such a thematic, focusing particularly on image theatre techniques. As an academic and practitioner I am very interested in narratives and in narrative analysis as a critical approach in understanding and consuming the social ideas. In my work with my students and workshop participants I pay a lot of attention to 'reading the images' and critical dealing with existing representations. Therefore, I believe that 'humanizing the perpetrator' starts with questioning the representations we deal with; identifying who creates such representations and what is the ideological/moral purpose of it. Some questions I am particularly interested to open include: what characteristics do rape perpetrators carry? What do we know about their out-of-war context love and sexual relationship? How does the positive portrayal of rape perpetrators impact the survivors? Which moral codes does it question? Why humanizing the rape perpetrator at all? I would like to discuss those questions on the concrete cases and controversies that appeared in the context of 'humanizing the rape perpetrator' in the case of Bosnian war.

Nena Močnik received her PhD at University of Ljubljana, with the thesis of conflict-related rape and sexual violence, the potential survivors' recovery of intimacy and sexual life, and the role of surrounding community in the recovery process. Besides teaching classes on anti-discrimination, anti-racism and multicultural dialogue at the Department of Culturology, she has been teaching in different non-formal educational programs, training courses and workshops. As a Theatre of the Oppressed practitioner, she has been teaching in the contexts of gender-based violence, different forms of social and individual oppressions and social exclusions. As a part of her PhD, she developed and applied participatory drama techniques as a research methodology in the communities of rape-in-war survivors in Bosnia-Herzegovina. In 2014, she was Fulbright visiting researcher and applied drama practitioner at University of Southern California, School for Dramatic Arts, Applied Drama Programme and in 2015 a Brown University Fellow (Brown International Advanced Research Institute) Her written academic works have been published in national and international scientific monographs and journals and presented on conferences worldwide. Her master thesis was awarded national award for the best student works (Preseren Prize) and her doctoral thesis is nominated for the best thesis of the year. In the Fall of 2015 she will reside in Copenhagen as a COST - Short Term Research Exchange Scholar for the study of collective memory and trauma.

Eva van Roekel (Utrecht University)

In Argentina, after more than 30 years of official impunity regarding the crimes like the thousands of disappearances, assassinations, unlawful detentions and tortures during the civil-military regime between 1976 and 1983, in 2005 the Argentine Supreme Court annulled the former amnesty laws. Since then more than 1,500 mainly military officers of all rank and file have recently been charged at federal courts throughout the country for crimes against humanity.

My anthropological research emerges from the premise that any profound comprehension of retributive justice after state violence requires ethnographic explorations in order to unlock different co-existing moralities regarding justice, also those of perpetrators. Based on twenty months of fieldwork on the lived experiences of state violence and justice amongst victims and perpetrators that are involved in the trials of crimes against humanity, this paper concentrates specifically on data gathered from in-depth interviews and participatory observations with indicted and loyal military officers at court, prison and their homes, and documentation on local military ethical codes and educational handbooks.

Without falling into apologetic analyses, this paper offers nuanced insights in the lived experiences of the trials by these military officers and gives in-depth insight in a transformative local moral world of indicted and loyal military officers that shape alternative interpretations of accountability and state violence. In so doing, it employs an affective lens in order to deconstruct these lived experiences. By analyzing metaphors and silences in perpetrators' testimonies and through the analysis of remorse and shame, alternative insights in perpetrators' perceptions of on the one hand responsibility and blame, and on the other hand, immorality and state-induced violence are suggested.

In so doing, this ethnographic research addresses urgent matters on how the role of agency is conceptualized by perpetrators themselves, in contrast to civil understanding of blame. In addition, by including a longitudinal time frame of these officers' judgments on state violence, it illustrates that by living in the midst of changing political constellations, where previous atrocities are judged differently by new interpretations of international humanitarian law, deeply influences how these men interpret their previous unlawful actions.

Eva van Roekel graduated as Master of Science in Latin American and Caribbean Studies at Utrecht University in 2007. During her studies (BA and MA) she conducted fieldwork in Caracas, Venezuela on research topics about political conflict, poverty and stigma. Since 2009 she has been working on a PhD research project in Cultural Anthropology on transitional justice, feelings, and law in post-dictatorial Argentina. Furthermore, Eva teaches Bachelor students of the Department of Cultural Anthropology at Utrecht University and Master students of the Department of Political Science at the University of Amsterdam.

Julia Sarbo (Anne Frank Huis, Amsterdam)

My name is Julia Sarbo (Budapest, Hungary 1980), and I hold an educational master in history (Rijksuniversiteit Groningen 2005). After teaching for one year at a high school in Groningen I joined the staff of the educational department of the Anne Frank House in 2006. I currently hold the position of project leader, which means I am responsible for complex projects. I have worked on historical as well as contemporary projects. The historical work is related to the Second World War, the Holocaust and the life of Anne Frank. The contemporary projects are aimed to let students and visitors reflect on the dangers of antisemitism, racism and discrimination and the importance of freedom, equal rights and democracy.

The topic of teaching about Nazi perpetrators has had my interest for some time now. I would like to mention three projects and/or activities that I have been, and am still, involved in where this topic is relevant. I had the opportunity to be part of an fellowship in 2011-2012, an intense training course at the Imperial War Museum in London. During this fellowship I visited both the Imperial War Museum and Yad Vashem. As part of this programme I was enrolled at the University of London, to follow a course on holocaust education. The task was to write two papers and for these papers I chose the topic of teaching about Nazi perpetrators. The how and why was my main focus. For these papers I read about the Browning vs. Goldhagen debate, as well as many Dutch articles (mostly via NIOD).

The next year (2013) we had quite an intense discussion at the Anne Frank House, about how to deal with the perpetrators in the story of Anne and her family. There used to be, today this is taken out, a display on Karl Silberbauer, the SS-officer who lead the arrest team that entered the annex August 4th 1944. This man, showed inside the museum on a large photograph that was taken during the war, was the closest person to the perpetrator figure in the life of the people in hiding. But he was not involved in the betrayal. He was 'just' the SS officer in charge. After a lot of debate, it was decided to take away the information about him and the rest of the arrest team. I did and do not agree completely with this decision, as today there is no mention at all about the perpetrators in the history of Anne Frank. As a way to deal with this lack of information, I have developed a teaching pack for our group department, in which the members of the arrest team are introduced. This way, school groups that are visiting the house can get to know some of the perpetrators more in depth. The arrest team was led by the Austrian Silberbauer, but the other team members were Dutch policemen, collaborators. I searched for primary source material in which these men tell us more about their reasons for collaborating. The teaching pack is quite popular with teachers.

From 2014 onwards I have been involved in the biggest perpetrator related project that the Anne Frank House has developed in recent years. This is a one week study trip to the House of Wannsee. Participants are Dutch history teachers and the main focus of this study programme is how to teach about perpetrators, at authentic places if possible. I will be heading this study trip in October 2015. For this task I am reading Welzer, Sereny, Evelien Gans, Bart van der Boom and (hopefully) many more interesting books and articles to find out more about the possibilities of teaching about Nazi perpetrators. As part of this research and preparation for this trip I would very much like to be part of your working group.

Sibylle Schmidt (Freie Universität Berlin)

In the last decades, testimony has become a keyword, not to say a model for education and ethical learning after war and genocide. The discourse is focused on the victim-witness, as opposed to the traditional legal concept of the testifier as a bystander (Agamben 2002, Margalit 2002). Victims' testimonies offer both the wrong of the crime and the truth of the event. Survivor testimony is thus not only an informative, but a performative act: It is invoked to address another and to appeal to a community (Felman/Laub 1992).

This constellation of testimony is challenged by contemporary phenomena of perpetrator testimonies, as they are called upon and recorded in the course of Truth and Reconciliation Commissions, or displayed in documentary films such as Joshua Oppenheimer's „The Act of Killing“ (Denmark/United Kingdom/Norway 2012) or Avi Mograbis „Z 32“ (Israel 2008). In these cases, the testifier does not bear witness to her or his own suffering, but to the harm that he or she has done to others.

Together with Prof. José Brunner from Tel Aviv University, I would like to work out some dimensions of the phenomenon of perpetrator testimonies. We take into account different forms of perpetrator testimony, such as the memoirs of Adolf Eichmann, Nazi perpetrators attesting in court, and perpetrator accounts in transitional justice formats such as truth commissions. In which respect can perpetrator testimony be regarded as testimony at all – and how does it differ from confession? What kind of knowledge – factual and ethical – can perpetrator testimony bring about?

Extending the emphatic notion of testimony to perpetrators' accounts is highly problematic: On the side of the testifier, it can lead to self-victimization. On the side of the recipient, it can lead to unintended complicity. For a critical approach to these statements, we think it is necessary to go beyond the traditional hermeneutics of testimony, and to develop a set of new, more specific questions. As testimony is not a monologue, but always takes place in a dialogical framework, we need to reflect upon our role in this process, too: What do we, as individuals or as a society, expect from perpetrators' testimonies? Last but not least: Whence does the actual rise of interest in the figure of the perpetrator in contemporary culture come from?

Bio:

Since 2012	Postdoctoral researcher and teaching assistant at the Institute for Philosophy, Freie Universität Berlin, and researcher in the interdisciplinary project "Testimony/Bearing Witness. A controversial concept", funded by the German Scientific Foundation
2013	Dissertation in Philosophy, Freie Universität Berlin (summa cum laude)
2011-2012	Doctoral fellow at the Martin Buber Society of Fellows, Hebrew University Jerusalem
2009-2011	Ph.D- student at Freie Universität Berlin
2008	M.A. Freie Universität Berlin (Philosophy, German Literature; Grade 1,0/A)
2001-2008	Studies at the Université Paris IV, Universität Freiburg and Freie Universität Berlin (Philosophy and Literature)

Uğur Ümit Üngör (Utrecht University)

Uğur Ümit Üngör gained his Ph.D. in 2009 (cum laude) at the University of Amsterdam. In 2008-09, he was Lecturer in International History at the Department of History of the University of Sheffield, and in 2009-10, he was Post-Doctoral Research Fellow at the Centre for War Studies of University College Dublin. Currently he is Associate Professor at the Department of History at Utrecht University and Research Fellow at the Institute for War, Holocaust, and Genocide Studies in Amsterdam. His main areas of interest are state formation and nation formation, with a particular focus on mass violence. These interests necessitate a commitment to inter-disciplinarity at the intersections of social science and history. His most recent publications include *Confiscation and Destruction: The Young Turk Seizure of Armenian Property* (Continuum, 2011) and the award-winning *The Making of Modern Turkey: Nation and State in Eastern Anatolia, 1913-1950* (Oxford University Press, 2011). He is currently leading a research project that examines the involvement of paramilitaries in counter-insurgency operations, scorched earth campaigns, and mass violence against civilians including the perpetration of mass murder.