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Kao u zajedničkoj grobnici svatko je umro od svoje smrti navodno ljubav za istu stvar

Što radi njegova ključna kost uz ovu čeono
I na što će dotični nalikovati sastavljen od različitih dijelova kad dođe dan ustajanja

Posebno je pitanje od čega ćemo se mi sastaviti ako se ponovno odlučimo voljeti

Nema unaprijed zadanog poretka stvari
Iste se stvari mogu izvesti na više načina

Ciljana redukcija semantika
gramatika
komunikacija
govori čovjek na predavanju o stvarima koje s ovim gore nemaju nikakve veze

On ne zna da je sve u životu jedna te ista stvar
Kao s kraja na kraj razapet konopac na dvorištu na kojem se samo povremeno rublje mijenja.

Zagreb, 20.10.2001

Like in a mass grave everyone has died of one's own death apparently love of the same thing
What is his collarbone doing next to this frontal bone
And what will he look like
Reassembled from different parts
When the day of resurrection comes

It is a particular question
From what will we reassemble ourselves
If again we decide to love one another

There is no prior order of things
The same things can be assembled in different ways

Targeted reduction semantics
gramar
communication
a man gives a lecture
about things that have nothing to do with the above
He doesn't know that everything in life is one and the same thing
Like the clothes-line in the yard stretched from end to end
On which only infrequently is the laundry changed.


INTRODUCTION

From what will we reassemble ourselves brings together six contemporary artists, a team of researchers and an architect to reflect on the question posed by Croatian-Bosnian author Jozefina Dautbegović*: from which fragments - images, stories, archives and historical remnants - do you piece a life together in the wake of a genocide?

This exhibition was initiated by artist Anna Dasović, curator Katia Krupennikova and Framer Framed. For years, Dasović has been conducting intensive research into the context in which the Dutch Blue Helmets operated in 1995. Archival footage that Dasović obtained under the Dutch Public Access to Government Information Act (WOB) shows Dutch military exercises to prepare soldiers for deployment in the UN peacekeeping mission in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Her work raises relevant questions about how representation, as it was consciously and unconsciously employed within a Dutch military culture, had the implicit effect of reinforcing unsettling perceptions of the ‘other’.

The exhibition, curated by Natasha Marie Llorens, began with Dasović’s work but developed to include a multitude of critical analyses and approaches, inspired by the complexity of looking back on the genocide that took place 25 years ago. The works shown take a long view of the representation of genocidal violence. Including the monument, erected to stand for the memory of violence long after its eruption has subsided; the state archive, which holds the justification of what was seeable at the time; the personal archive and the body, bearers of stories outside the historical record. The exhibition recognises that this recent history is controversial and gives attentive space to those who survived this all-encompassing violence. Each work of art offers a perspective from which a memory of violence and loss can be reassembled and imagined.

The exhibition Temporary Monument - Srebrenica is Dutch History shows a series of portraits of Dutch Bosnians by Robin de Puy and interviews by Chris Keulemans, as an urging appeal to make the genocide of 1995 more prominent in Dutch history, education and public monuments. Temporary Monument can be seen in front of Framer Framed on the Oranje-Vrijstaatkade in Amsterdam. The exhibitions invite the viewer to both identify with and examine the position of the bystander to genocidal violence – the one who is often unnoticed or omitted from the historical frame, but whose witnessing lives on and colours our memory.

*The title of the exhibition is taken from the poem The Unidentified (2003) by Jozefina Dautbegović.
From what will we reassemble ourselves was conceived by Anna Dasović in response to an invitation by Framer Framed to present a body of work she has been developing for years centered on the representation of the genocide which occurred in and around Srebrenica. It did not stay a solo exhibition. Instead, it evolved into a multilateral collaboration between the participants involved and she and I. This evolution is meant to address how difficult it is to represent the genocide, and it constitutes a refusal to do so from a singular perspective. From what will we reassemble ourselves renders a spectrum of positions which displace a male militarised perspective on which the public discourse in the Netherlands has primarily centered.

I come to the exhibition in the same position, perhaps, as many of its visitors, which is to say that I knew very little about the violent wars in Bosnia and Herzegovina in the 1990s in the wake of the dissolution of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (SFRY). I was also unaware of the Dutch Netherlands Army’s deployment of blue helmets in the UN peace-keeping mission to Srebrenica and of the enduring impact of the murderous events that took place there in July 1995 on the collective psyche in the Netherlands. What drew me into the project was the rigorousness with which Dasović interrogates the representation of violence and our shared understanding of the problems that arise from such representations, problems which are also at the heart of the political role of aesthetic practice more broadly.

To do justice to the range of problems attendant to the representation of violence would require many hundreds of pages, and in fact Ana Hoffner’s book The Queerness of Memory (2018) and Erna Rijstdijk’s Lost in Srebrenica (2011)—both authors who are also part of the exhibition—do this work in depth with regard to the wars in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Nevertheless, in broad strokes the problem with the representation of violence is that violence traumatizes and thus, as Cathy Caruth argues so lucidly, “trauma is not locatable in the simply violent or original event in an individual’s past, but rather in the way that its very unassimilated nature—the way it was precisely not known in the first instance—returns to haunt the survivor later on.” If even the survivor cannot know, in an ultimate sense, the event of violence that traumatized them, how could anyone else claim to understand it well enough to picture it faithfully, or with finality? The implications of this impasse are vast because the (im)possibility of showing genocide irrefutably makes the categories that depend on visual proof for their legitimacy unstable.

Violence destabilises representation, in other words, and yet the genocidal events in Srebrenica, Zvornik, Žepa, Prijedor, Trnopolje, Omarska, Sarajevo and so many other places during the conflicts must be rendered somehow. Their dead must be mourned and the dehumanisation that made their deaths possible must be denounced for their sake, but also for the sake of the Europeans and the Americans who were complicit in these processes. Settled into the instability of representation, From what will we reassemble ourselves contributes to this imperative.

What follows is a conversation between myself and Anna Dasovic about her research, the socio-political context for the exhibition, and the connections we both see to the works presented.

Natasha Marie (NM): Can you talk a bit about why it was important to you to open this exhibition up to other practitioners?

Anna (A): If I have learned anything from working on and thinking with Srebrenica, it is that there is no consensus on its representation. It is necessary, at a moment that marks its 25-year commemoration, to move away from the understanding of Srebrenica as a singular event that transpired over ‘just’ a month in July 1995. My work around Srebrenica needed to be read as one part of a polyphony of positions which address the representation of violence in a broader scope. I also felt it was crucial to go beyond the white male militarised doctrine which my own work is centred on and to include positions that are not marked by Dutch whiteness.

NM: Your mother was born in the Netherlands and your father was born in the former Yugoslavia. You carry his name and thus perhaps also some of the racialised stigma attached to people in the Netherlands with that background. I wonder how this informs your understanding of whiteness, and why, when you speak about this project, you insist on your own Dutch-ness.

A: Ever since I started the work on Srebrenica, my ‘roots’ have been at the heart of assumptions curators, art critics, and journalists make about who I am as an artist and as a speaking subject. It confuses people, especially here in the Netherlands, when they realize that within my artistic practice I explicitly choose not to identify as someone from the territories of the Former Yugoslavia. It is as if they lose their hold on me, their sense of what I am allowed to say.
NM: So, because of your last name people imagine you can only embody one ethnicity—one that belongs elsewhere?

A: Yes. My refusal to let my work be read in relation to my ethnicity brushes against the grain of a fantasy that people in the Former West wish to sustain about the origin of these wars, which comes down to an essentialised understanding of ethnicity.²

If we look at the persistence with which a few ethno-nationalist politicians in the SFRY managed to employ a fictionalised sense of ethnic entitlement as a justification to “ethnically cleanse” whole geographical territories, this is not a strange fantasy, but it is nevertheless inaccurate. The terms “ethnic cleansing” have now become widespread even in Western media but they actually originate in Serbian propaganda from the 1980s. This detail is important, as to center ethnicity in the discourse around Srebrenica is to speak with language invented by the perpetrator and to unconsciously reproduce their propaganda.

Normalising the term “ethnic cleansing” took years and it had one goal: building public consensus on ethnicity as the ‘true’ justification for the dissolution of Yugoslavia and the resulting wars. This claim about ethnic entitlement allowed politicians to privatise SFRY’s assets and claim its territory. The process was accelerated by the United States, which doomed the Federation to bankruptcy by cutting off credit to Yugoslavia, which in part caused its dissolution. Then the US funded those politicians who actively campaigned for such a dissolution on ethnic grounds, further legitimising them.³

The Former West has been deeply complicit in sustaining this fiction, casting people as participants of an ‘(un)civil war’ and assigning them reductively to an ‘ethnic’ identity. It allows people in the Netherlands to designate the violence which culminated in genocide in Srebrenica as originating there instead of here.

I insist on speaking from a Dutch perspective because it makes me complicit in the production of this divide—which is a neo-colonial divide—between Europe and its exterior, between the ‘civilised West’ and its ‘barbaric ethnic Others’.

NM: I wonder about how the ‘othering’ of people and the representation of genocide relate to feminism here. The exhibition is dominated by the perspectives of artists who identify as women. To what degree was this a decision on your part?

A: Dubravka Žarkov has insisted that the bodies of men and women were the very symbolic embodiment that enabled ethnicity to be upheld. What, then, are the sites upon which the wars in a dissolved Yugoslavia were fought. It is this lived and quasi-monumental structure that houses each visitor’s body, Ana Hoffner’s work on embodied memory and Selma Selman’s work on the pluralism of experience within the body in a way that Marko Peljhan’s more analytical presentation does not. The contrast between these positions is important, but so is the skew towards a presentation of what the body knows. I see this curatorial bias as feminist.

Also, I agree with you about the way colonialism and orientalism position women in relation to territory, but I would add two other problematic stereotypical representations of them: first, that women are emancipated through their overly-sexualised visibility and, second, as the mute victims of their male counter-parts’ irrational violence. We don’t entirely avoid either of these stereotypes, actually: the newareel that Hito Steyerl tries to re-create is a propaganda/educational film about Bosnian women learning to read and Bosnian Muslim women unveiling themselves triumphantly; the women in Lana Čmajčanin’s work are both the graphic victims of sexual violence and closely identified with native plants. Lana Čmajčanin is explicitly deconstructing this kind of representation, but Steyerl’s work is more ambivalent about its rejection of orientalising narratives concerning the veiled, illiterate woman.

These contradictions are essential to a feminist approach to exhibition-making, which challenges the structural privilege of one position by insisting on pluralism in representation.

A: Dubravka Žarkov is again very helpful here: “The Srebrenica trauma’ in the Netherlands is “a discourse in which masculinity, military and nation are linked in a very specific way.”⁴ The consequences of this discourse are enormous, as the fall of Srebrenica is deemed significant only when transformed into an element of Dutch national sentiment about its men.

NM: What you are saying is that the focus in the Netherlands is on a gendered form of trauma, white masculine trauma suffered in the context of a nationalist organisation, as opposed to a more responsible focus on the gendered trauma suffered by women.
A: Yes. Centring the exhibition on female-identified positions means insisting on having a different conversation. It also insists on attending to the life that continued to be lived in Srebrenica.

‘The Facing Srebrenica’ project is important in this respect, even if I think showing pictures from the personal archives of Dutch soldiers is difficult and full of contradictions. Including their research is a way to open up a space for the human agency of individual Dutch soldiers deployed there without falling into the trap of either asking those individuals to be accountable for military decisions that were made on a much higher level or asking them to re-perform their trauma.

But also, and more importantly, Azir Osmanović’s request to Erna Rijndijk for pictures, for ‘an image’ of his brother, is a manifestation of the desire of those who lived on afterwards to find a human picture of the murdered. This desire attenuates the question in Dautbegović’s poem: From what will we reassemble ourselves, if again we decide to love one another?

NM: It was also important to me to include work that was not directly related to the genocide in Srebrenica. The idea was to widen representation to include the images of violence that conditioned its possibility. What are the problems with the existing or mainstream forms of representation from your perspective?

A: When we speak about the genocide in Srebrenica in the Netherlands, and in general, the default is to talk about the span of a few days during which the enclave fell, the deportation of men and women from the compound, and the executions. While it remains crucial to continue to discuss that period for many political reasons, it also limits a viewer’s understanding of genocide. Genocide is rather a process with definitive stages.³

At which moment in time did the classification of peoples begin? Who made them into ‘ethnic’ subjects? To what extent did the racialised perceptions of outside actors sustain the dehumanisation of people in Srebrenica? This project does not give definitive answers, but it does want to position those few days in July within these questions and in the context of European politics of the 1990s as a continuation of imperialism, conquest and colonial tendencies. Especially because the establishment of international courts in the 90s under the guise of a human rights discourse obscured European colonial history by allowing it to present itself as an ethical peacekeeping continent.

For the people in Srebrenica, the intention to annihilate them started years before the genocide when their neighbours started to call them “Turks” and started raping and executing them. This did not unfold over a week in July, but systematically over several years. Walid Sadek compellingly describes the survivor as “a witness who knows too much carrying an unwelcome but necessary knowledge.”⁴

When the enclave finally fell, the people in Srebrenica were already witnesses in Sadek’s sense. How does this correspond to Caruth’s assertion of the traumatic event as unknowable?

NM: The unwelcome knowledge of the survivor is essential, of course I agree. But what is so valuable in Caruth’s work, among that of others, is her articulation of the representation of genocide as a political problem. How does the survivor communicate knowledge? In what arena or framing discourse? What limitations does representation impose on their testimony? This is also where Hito Steyerl’s work is crucial to the exhibition: she is trying to reconstitute a film using the testimony of those who witnessed and survived its destruction, and I think this attempt fails beautifully to locate and render the “truth” of this particular event during the siege of Sarajevo.

Another way to think about this problem is through Marko Peljhan’s work, which pictures radio communications from many different perspectives during the fall of the UN “Safe Area”. They are recordings of people who participated, but if they are perpetrators do they also carry the unwelcome knowledge of the survivor? No, not exactly. But they know things that survivors did not yet know and the representation of the genocide as seen from the traces they left is crucial to establishing the “truth” of the events, no?

NM: This brings me to a final question: We spoke at length in preparation for this project about the figure of the bystander, the one who was not involved but who saw in many different senses of that word. Can you talk about why this figure is important to you?

A: I don’t think the figure of the bystander is either singular or stable, rather it brings a whole range of additional questions to bear on the representation of genocide. Which people count as bystanders and which hide behind the guise of that figure and its inherent impossibility? What is the bystander able to witness through representation and to whom are they accountable by virtue of representation? What does the bystander know, fail to know, and fail to admit to already knowing?

Judith Butler asks, “how do we understand the frame as part of the materiality of war and the efficiency of its violence?”⁵ I would extend this question to ask: How did the people in Srebrenica arrive to us through the image, and how is that frame complicit in their final disappearance? This is also to ask which body, which structure, which society allows the disappearance of a people.⁶
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BACKGROUND

The Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (SFRY) was dissolved at a precarious moment in the history of Europe, following the fall of the Berlin Wall, when the European Union set out on an ambitious project of enlargement, seemingly to fulfill the post-WWII promise of ‘never again’. When armed conflict broke out, governments all over Europe were initially hesitant to respond to grave reports of ethnic cleansing, carefully dissociating their now ‘democratic and civilised’ Europe from the bloody ‘civil wars’ simultaneously taking place in another Europe. In 1993, about three-quarters of the 50,000 – 60,000 Bosnian Muslim population in Eastern Bosnia and Herzegovina fled their towns and villages to a large area around Srebrenica, to escape the ‘ethnic cleansing’ campaigns of Bosnian Serb forces. Their lives in Srebrenica remained in imminent danger as Bosnian Serb forces besieged the area. It is in this context that the United Nations signed resolution 819, one of its most controversial resolutions to date, formally establishing a UN “safe area” around Srebrenica.

In 1994 the Dutch government sent the first of three lightly-armed UNPROFOR battalions to protect the “Safe Area” Srebrenica. In July 1995, Srebrenica was overrun by Bosnian Serb forces without meeting any effective resistance from the air nor from the ground. The Dutch UN soldiers stood by to the separation of the Bosnian Muslim men from the women from their compound. The Bosnian Serbs deported the women and small children and murdered 8,372 men and boys. The International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia concluded in several judgments that the massacre was an act of genocide. In 2019 the Dutch Supreme Court ruled that the Dutch State is partially responsible for the deaths of 350 men that were executed in the genocide.
In “Targeting ‘Turks’: How Karadžić Laid the Foundations for Genocide,” Suljagić describes the way his identity was re-conceptualised to serve the political ends of the Bosnian Serb war criminal Radovan Karadžić. It is re-printed here both for context on the framing narrative used to justify the siege of Sarajevo, the longest siege of a capital city in modern warfare, and the structural violence that culminated in genocidal violence across Bosnia and Herzegovina. Suljagić has the unique position of being a survivor and a witness. He is a political scientist who is also responsible for the representation of memory in his role at the Srebrenica Genocide Memorial. He has devoted his life to acquiring an evaluative language, which poignantly articulates how extreme forms of dehumanisation have culminated into genocidal violence.

TARGETING ‘TURKS’:
HOW KARADZIC LAID THE FOUNDATIONS FOR GENOCIDE

Emir Suljagić
Sarajevo, 15 April 2019

Bosnian Serb wartime leader Radovan Karadzic was the key figure involved in dehumanising Bosnian Muslims, redefining them as the enemy and making genocidal violence a political policy, says Emir Suljagić, who survived the 1995 Srebrenica massacres.

I was 14 years old the first time I was called a Turk. It was used as a slur, a swear word, an insult. I only knew about Turks from history lessons as foreign occupiers. I had never seen an actual Turk up to that point in my life.

But the message was unmistakable: because of my alleged ‘Turkishness’, I was less worthy, less human.
In the years that followed, my identity - our identity - was reconceptualised, reduced to this one single element of being ‘Turks’; nothing else mattered, not who or what else we were. As such, our very existence was deemed a mortal threat by the Serb elites in Bosnia and Herzegovina and Serbia.

Central to the effort of recasting and dehumanising Bosnian Muslims, and the consequent use of genocidal violence as legitimate policy, was Radovan Karadzic.

The regime of Radovan Karadzic was not totalitarian in the sense that Nazism or Stalinism were; yet it was a regime that existed solely for the purpose of murder – the physical annihilation of non-Serbs, or more specifically, Bosnian Muslims.

Let me quote from Karadzic’s court verdict a description of some of the events that took place in Rogatica in eastern Bosnia during the war:

“At night soldiers would bang on the walls and open the doors violently, flash their flashlights onto the faces of detainees, choose women and girls at random, say they were being taken for questioning but they would take them away to be raped. The other detainees could hear the women and girls screaming for help. Women and girls as young as seven, as well as a 13-year-old boy, were taken out of the classrooms almost every night for a period of two-and-a-half months and raped by the police and soldiers who guarded the camp.”

The lifetime prison sentence handed down last month in The Hague to the key architect of the Srebrenica genocide is therefore a welcome step; symbolism matters. But it ultimately means nothing, because Karadzic will be outlived by his life’s work. His unique contribution to genocide is that he, almost singlehandedly, provided genocide with sustainability by framing it as a public good.

Karadzic is not a marginal figure from the far-right fringe. He was at the centre of a broad nationalist movement hell-bent on pursuing the genocidal strategy of removing and annihilating non-Serbs in the area of Bosnia and Herzegovina that is today known as Republika Srpska.

In a telephone conversation with Karadzic, Dobrica Cosic, the pre-eminent Serb nationalist and later president of the rump Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, emphasised the centrality of Karadzic’s efforts to Serb nationalism:

“You are completing a historic process... simply, there are two concepts, there is the uniting of the South Slavs and there is the uniting of Serbs... the unity of the South Slavs has historically failed but uniting of Serbs has not. Historically, it is now to be completed or perish,” Cosic said.

More than 60 per cent of Serbs living in Republika Srpska consider him a hero, suggested an public opinion poll commissioned by Al Jazeera Balkans in 2018; in Serbia, a 2012 OSCE survey on attitudes towards the Hague Tribunal and war crime prosecutions found that around 50 per cent of respondents thought that Karadzic and his military commander Ratko Mladic were not responsible for the war crimes with which they were charged.

We might not be able to accept the reality of this massive and enthusiastic support for Karadzic’s genocidal project. But this does not change the fact that Karadzic should be considered one of the most important figures in the Serb history of the 20th Century.

‘You’re going to be slaughtered’

Karadzic’s centrality to the genocidal violence against Bosnian Muslims lies in two overlapping processes: the reconceptualisation of Bosnian Muslims’ identity and the mainstreaming of the intent to annihilate them.

The reconceptualisation of identity refers to the process by which the victim group is portrayed as “lying outside the political community”, as “an almost superhumanly powerful enemy whose continued existence threatens the very survival of the political community”, or paradoxically as sub- or non-human, according to political scientist Maureen S. Hiebert.

Karadzic had a wealth of imagery and heritage to draw on in reconceptualising Bosnian Muslims; from the early 19th Century to the formation of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia to the Second World War, “the Muslims in the Balkans sometimes became viewed as a kind of ethnic ‘fifth column’, left over from a previous era, who could never be integrated successfully into the planned future national states”, historian Cathie Carmichael wrote in her article ‘The Ethnic Cleansing of Slav Muslims and its Role in Serbian and Montenegrin Discourses since 1800’.

Islam was the element of the Bosnian Muslims’ identity that lent itself most to reconceptualisation. It was therefore used by the Serb elites to construct Bosnian Muslims as a mortal threat that must be physically removed from the projected Serb states to be built on the ruins of Yugoslavia.

Both as a prelude to violence as well as when it started in earnest, the motif of ‘the Turk’ was prevalent. In my hometown of Bratunac, graffiti written on public and private property alike read: “Muslims, Balijas [derogatory words for Bosniaks], Turks – move out, you’re going to be slaughtered.” Detainees in the Luka detention camp in Brcko were referred to by their guards as “a Turkish gang, a fictitious people, a non-existent people”, according to the Karadzic trial judgment.

And after there were no more Muslims left in Zvornik, the Drina Corps of the Bosnian Serb Army – which would play a crucial role in the genocidal operation in Srebrenica three years later – reported that with “the arrival of paramilitary organisations to the Zvornik municipality, particularly the arrival of [paramilitary leader] Arkan and his people, this territory was liberated from the Turks”.

The Drina Corps’ report, quoted in Karadzic’s verdict, continued: “Turks made up 60 per cent of the municipality’s population and it has now been cleansed and replaced with an ethnically pure Serb population.”

This intent had already began to emerge by the end of 1991, through what author Robert Donia aptly refers to in his book about Karadzic as “disappearance
discourse”. In telephone conversations with his friends and allies – intercepted by the Bosnian State Security Service – Karadzic relished the imminent “disappearance” of Muslims.

“They must know that there are 20,000 armed Serbs around Sarajevo, man. This is not normal, they will, they will disappear! Sarajevo will be a melting pot in which 300,000 Muslims will die;” he said during one call.

“They are not normal. I don’t know. I’ll have to tell them openly now: people, don’t push your fuckin’ luck – there are three, four hundred thousand armed Serbs in Bosnia and Herzegovina. What do you think? ... They do not understand that there would be bloodshed and that the Muslim people would be exterminated.”

A few days after this conversation, Karadzic made an identical threat during a session of the Bosnian parliament: “Don’t think you won’t lead Bosnia and Herzegovina into hell and possibly the Muslim nation to disappear, for the Muslim people will not be able to defend themselves if it comes to war here!”

Karadzic was also central to the genocidal enterprise in the organisational respect. While the genocidal vision of his regime was clear in the six ‘Strategic Objectives of the Serb People’, adopted by the Bosnian Serb parliament on May 12, 1992, the blueprint for genocide was laid out in the lesser-known ‘Instructions for the Organisation and Operation of the Organs of Serb People in Bosnia and Herzegovina in Emergency Conditions’, colloquially referred to as the ‘Variant A and Variant B’ document drafted by the top echelon of Karadzic’s Serb Democratic Party, the SDS.

The document was instrumental to the onset of genocide: firstly, it provided instructions for a series of local and regional coup d’états, takeovers of a “critical segment of the state apparatus, which is then used to displace the government from its control of the remainder”; secondly, it outlined means and ways of removing non-Serb populations from the areas claimed by the Serbs.

Karadzic, in other words, was a central figure to all the aspects of genocide: the conceptualisation of intent, the reconceptualisation of the victim group, and finally its organisation.

From Srebrenica to Christchurch

In today’s intellectual climate of the ‘othering’ of Muslims, with the growing far-right in Europe and the US clearly marking Muslims as a civilisational enemy, murderous Islamophobia – the likes of which we witnessed in Christchurch in New Zealand – is encouraged. It has been long time coming and Karadzic’s contribution to it is immeasurable.

Karadzic was the vanguard of the murderous and combustible mixture of extremist ideas that have been normalised and increasingly mainstreamed at the beginning of the 21st Century. In another conversation with Cosic, Karadzic prophesised:

“European nationalisms are yet to flame up. They think that the time for nationalism has passed.”

Hariz Halilovich, a survivor of detention camps in Prijedor in 1992 who is now a professor at RMIT University in Australia, recently wrote that visual and spoken references to Karadzic and the Bosnian genocide on the extremist right in the West do not only “reveal a branching, international narrative of cultural and religious conflict” but “also include a shared methodology, in a clear effort to create a desired context for the murders”.

By unleashing “brooding, unpredictable and powerful forces” on the Bosnian Muslims the “subterranean world” of the poetry that he also wrote, Karadzic was instrumental in transforming the landscape of ideas in the West. Mass murderers across the world learn from one another; social structures are transformed by agency in a mutually constitutive process.

Karadzic has bequeathed to us a world in which remembrance is hate, the truth is violence, and the lie is freedom.

As much as they do not differ in their physical appearance from the European Scandinavians, the Germans or the Dutch, the Bosnian Muslims would never be regarded as sufficiently white and European because of their Islamic heritage. But this is not a Bosnian or ‘Turkish’ problem; other groups are equally vulnerable to dehumanisation and identity re-construction.

I have paid the full price of being a ‘Turk’. After years of struggling, I have realised that genocidal intent is in the eye of the beholder, and I have embraced my ‘Turkish’ identity.

But one should keep in mind that genocidal ideologies are always on the lookout for new ‘Turks’.

The only question now is: “Who among you is the next ‘Turk?’”

This comment article was part of a keynote speech at the Columbia University seminar Lessons from the Ground: Framing and Interpreting Lessons from the Balkans.

Emir Suljagić (b. Ljubovija, Yugoslavia, 1975) is a journalist, activist and politician and the Director of the Srebrenica Genocide Memorial since 2019. When Suljagić was seventeen, he fled the Drina Valley with his family as a result of ‘ethnic cleansing’ campaigns. They took refuge Srebrenica in 1992, where he eventually became an English interpreter employed by the United Nations. Suljagić worked as a correspondent for the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia in The Hague between 2002 and 2004. Suljagić has published widely for The New York Times, the Boston Globe, AlJazeera, El Pais, Die Zeit, and Liberation (Oslobodenje) among others. He holds a Ph.D. in Political Science from the University of Hamburg (2010). Emir Suljagic teaches International Relations at the International University of Sarajevo. He is the author of Postcards from the Grave, a first-hand account of the Srebrenica genocide.
WITH WORKS BY

LANA ČMAJČANIN

Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina, 1983
—
Balkangreuel – Balkan Cruelty (2019)
Installation, print on wallpaper, dimensions variable.

The project is based on a drawing portfolio entitled Balkangreuel by Gottfried Sieben. The portfolio was created in 1909 after Bosnia and Herzegovina was annexed to the Austro-Hungarian Empire as the outcome of the Berlin Congress, which redistributed colonies among the European powers. Delivered in various formats and languages, the drawing portfolio was intended for the Austro-Hungarian elite and was very popular at the time. Balkangreuel was composed of pornographic material that also served as wartime propaganda, dehumanising the enemy by portraying men in stereotypical terms as the “Balkans savage”, while women’s bodies were cast as a territorial subject to usurpation and conquest.

Čmajčanin’s Balkangreuel – Balkan Cruelty is a wall installation that repossesses twelve motifs from the drawing portfolio by the same name, but embeds them in a comprehensive graphic design so that the viewer has to look carefully to discern them. This design includes floral motifs created from twelve flowers endemic to the territory of the 19th century Balkans. At first glance, these beautiful elements dominate the work, but a more thorough consideration reveals soldiers wearing the uniforms of Balkan countries engaged in sexual acts. By employing this dual ornamentation, the wall installation foregrounds the popularity of prejudice about the Other and the East, a popularity that served to highlight the 19th century reader’s own exceptionality and alleged civility.

Čmajčanin’s work also illustrates how long racialised and Orientalist representations of the Balkans have circulated and, through their circulation, confirmed the ideological difference between a “civilised” Europe and a “barbaric” other. The fact that such images were so well-established in the 19th century may account for the ease with which they were resurrected during the wars in the 1990s.

Lana Čmajčanin is a PhD scholar at the Academy of Fine Arts Vienna. Her work is mainly concerned with the impact of political and social power structures and control mechanisms on our existence and it is questioning the issues of responsibility and manipulation. Her practice reflects the interweaving of different media and encompasses installations, video works, performances and sound installations, photography, and media art.
ANNA DASOVIĆ

Amsterdam, the Netherlands, 1982

—

Before the fall there was no fall
(2015-ongoing)

Episode 01: Raw material (2019)
Two screen video installation, 47’.

Commissioned by Framer Framed and the Van Abbemuseum.

—

Episode 02: Surfaces (2020)
Video, 19’.

This commission video work will unfold in three parts which will be added at separate moments throughout the exhibitions’ duration. The first part, Epilogue, will be presented during the opening.

Commissioned by Framer Framed and Künstlerhaus Büchsenhausen. Supported by Mondriaan Fonds.

Before the fall there was no fall is a research-based project which centres on a collection of roughly 100 Super VHS tapes from an archive of the Dutch Ministry of Defense. Dasović used the Dutch Freedom of Information Act to request the tapes and, after a drawn-out process lasting four years, she was ultimately granted access to them. The tapes and their contextualising documents form the raw material for a series of episodes, public encounters and a publication that Dasović will produce in collaboration with other artists and thinkers over several years.

In Episode 01: Raw material (2019), Anna Dasović shows how the Royal Netherlands Army deployed language and role-play techniques to prepare Dutch UN soldiers for peacekeeping missions in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

The tapes document military exercises on NATO sites in Germany and Belgium in which Dutch “Blue Helmets” took part in role-playing encounters in preparation for their peacekeeping mission. The army brought in soldiers who had already been deployed to Bosnia and Herzegovina to play out scripted encounters as actors. They performed as members of the ‘local community’ with whom they had themselves come into contact. This substitution had the implicit effect of reinforcing socially constructed representations of “the Other.” The work consists entirely of ‘raw material’ from the tapes.

Episode 02: Surfaces is a comparative analysis between the raw material in Episode 01 and traces of Dutch soldiers’ presence in the ‘UN Safe Area Srebrenica’ 25 years later. How did the hands of Dutch soldiers touch these surfaces? What do the marks they left tell us about the Royal Netherlands Army deployed there? How is the culture of a Dutch military doctrine conceptualised by the people in these exercise videos, who subsequently left traces of that doctrine in their military compound in Srebrenica?

Dasović’s works suggest that the institutional racism of the Royal Netherlands Army is partly a consequence of distortions produced by the colonial past of the Netherlands.

—

Srebrenica who cares? (2017-ongoing)
Books, intervention with a marker and Indian ink.

In 1998, the Dutch UN commander Thom Karremans published the book Srebrenica Who Cares. Een puzzel van de werkelijkheid [A puzzle of reality] based on military diaries he kept during his deployment in Srebrenica. Dasović erases part of the title of every copy that she can find second hand with Indian ink. The title appears on the cover, the back flap, the title pages and at the bottom of almost every page. Once altered, the book, which was printed in an edition of 10,000, is put back into circulation, the proceedings of which will be used to buy new copies to alter.

Anna Dasović is focused on the rhetorical structures that make genocidal violence visible, and those deployed to obscure the politically inconvenient aspects of such conflicts. With a background in photography, Dasović now uses an interdisciplinary approach with archival research, fieldwork, and interviews to create video installations. Her work, often the result of long term engagements, with video montages, sound or text-based works, defy a fixed medium.

ANA HOFFNER EX-PRVULOVIC*

Paraćin, Yugoslavia, 1980

—

Transferred Memories – Embodied Documents (2014)
Video installation, colour/sound, 14’ 35’’.

Supported by Federal Chancellery of Austria, Academy of Fine Arts Vienna, les complices Zurich.

Performance: Vivienne Löschnner and Ana Hoffner
Camera: Judith Benedikt
Light: Hannes Böck
Sound: Lenja Gathmann
Hair and Makeup: Regina Breitfellner
Concept, Script and Postproduction: Ana Hoffner

Transferred Memories – Embodied Documents focuses on the confrontation between images of atrocities and those who face them. The video installation emphasises the affective reaction of the viewer to representations of graphic violence.

Two performers describe their encounter with material related to the wars in Bosnia and Herzegovina, listening to each other’s descriptions of their reactions. Hoffner sees their relationship to the source material, which is never directly pictured in the video, as queer: the performers speak from the body about the body’s perception of violence, rather than relying on the supposed objectivity of photography and film to adequately represent it.
The work includes a number of references to concentration camps located near Prijedor, northern Bosnia and Herzegovina, in particular Omarska and Trnopolje, which were within the same system of camps run by Serbian nationalists in the region. Hoffner includes a panning shot of the typed transcript of a video report made in 1992 by the Independent Television News (ITN) journalists Penny Marshall and Ian Williams. Another reference is to a still image of Fikret Alić among other prisoners behind a fence topped with barbwire. Alić’s image is actually a screen grab from the very same video report documentary. Other media outlets then made the moving footage into a freeze frame, an image of horror, which subsequently became an “iconic image” for the conflict as a whole. Moreover, through its visual semblance it established a strong relationship to photographs of Holocaust survivors taken at the liberation of the Nazi death camps.

Transferred Memories – Embodied Documents widens the scope of the exhibition’s framework beyond Srebrenica to interrogate both a spatial system affecting the body—the concentration camps—and the visual regime that circulated images of bodies which were dehumanised throughout the wars in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

Ana Hoffner ex-Prvulovic* is an artist, researcher and writer. She* works within and about contemporary art, art history, cultural studies and critical theory. She is interested in queerness, displays of global capital, coloniality and the East, forms of escape, early psychoanalysis as well as politics of memory and war. Hoffner works with video, photography, installation and performance. She* employs means of appropriation such as restaging photographs, interviews and reports, and searches for ways to desynchronise normative belongings of body and voice, sound and image. She* works explicitly against the current domination of corporate aesthetics, images of disgust and horror and the right-winged establishment by insisting on analysis, contextualisation and reflection. Hoffner seeks to introduce temporalities, relations and spaces in-between iconic images and highly performative events of our totalising contemporaneity.

* on the crossroads of who was born 1980 in Paraćin (Yugoslavia), who was moved in 1989, and received capitalist citizenship (Austria) with a new name in 2002.
years, these memories remained untouched, because it was necessary to focus on progress and building a future in the Netherlands. But the memories had not disappeared; they were always between the walls, always around me, ready to be broken open. The exhibition design is a representation of these walls. The visitor is invited to move ‘between the wall’ and to focus on - in parts that have been broken open - other perspectives as yet untold.”

Arna Mačkić’s exhibition design was commissioned in response to Anna Dasović’s on-going research which is the foundation for the exhibition, From what we reassemble ourselves. The visitor finds themselves in a narrow corridor connecting five archetypal rooms. Mačkić’s reference for these shapes is her own research on the Spomeniks, the Yugoslav word for monuments. The term also refers to abstract and brutalist World War II memorials erected throughout ex-Yugoslavia between 1960 and 1990. These monuments varied widely in scale and appearance, but they were intended to serve as a symbol of Tito’s Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and of the Yugoslav Partisans’ resistance against Axis occupation. A specific reference discussed during the design process was Bogdan Bogdanović’s Partisan Memorial Cemetery in Mostar. “The exhibition design obliquely references my research into Bogdan Bogdanović’s public monuments in order to make tangible Yugoslavia’s formal attempts to mourn its own violent pasts. The monuments designed by Bogdanović lack any symbolism of political ideology, war heroes, or religion. Bogdanović sought symbolism in abstract and archaic forms in order to connect people across difference. The design plan’s conceptual intention is to render palpable how difficult the history of the Bosnian territories is to access from the Netherlands today.”

Seen from the exterior, the exhibition design is abstract and monolithic, like its formal referent. Inside, the viewer is confronted with isolated containers for each work, producing a forced intimacy and preventing an overview of the whole exhibition. The impossibility of understanding everything at once mirrors the compartmentalisation of memory of the violence that the exhibition seeks to address and deconstruct.

Arna Mačkić is an architect and co-founder of Studio L A and the former head of Architectural Design at the Gerrit Rietveld Academy. Mačkić’s projects often relate to inclusion and exclusion mechanisms, refugees, collective identity and public domain. She aims to use architecture as a connecting voice, healing the wounds of the past without brushing away its scars which is the subject of her book, Mortal Cities & Forgotten Monument (Park Books, 2016). Mačkić is also part of Bosnian Girl, a collective which campaigns for an inclusive historiography and commemoration of the Srebrenica genocide in the Netherlands.

MARKO PELJHAN
Šempeter pri Gorici, Slovenia, 1969
—
Installation with sound, archive materials, dimensions variable.

Peljhan closely followed the events of the wars which spread across what was then Yugoslavia in the early 1990s, including the genocide in Srebrenica. He condensed information about those events into Territory 1995 (2009–2010), an installation consisting of a document archive and an enclosed, sonically and visually insulated space. In this space, the artist presents analysis maps of the electronic and radio communications of attacking Serbian nationalist forces during the operations in and around Srebrenica. The audio component of the work is a compilation of material drawn from the archives of the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia (ICTY) in The Hague and from Peljhan’s own research in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Peljhan collected the most damaging communications transcripts into two notebooks, which are on view at the entrance to the black box.

One of the reasons that the memory of the genocide at Srebrenica remains contested is not for lack of information about it but its excess. Territory 1995 organises some elements of that excess information to suggest the creative use of technology and the possibilities for
resistance that technology opens up, but the installation also demonstrates how much context is needed to really understand what happened in Srebrenica as events unfolded on the ground. Peljhan’s work functions as a dense representation capable of showing the horror of the genocide without recourse to photography.

Marko Peljhan initially studied at the Academy for Theater, Radio, Film and Television in Ljubljana, Slovenia when the war broke out in Yugoslavia in the early nineties. Working between the intersection of art, science and technology, his art and research revolves around communication, transport, and surveillance, and complex systems of political, economic, and military power. Peljhan’s art has evolved into a process involving a cartography of the invisible and the overlooked, and an analysis of the role of technology in society, particularly as it relates to power structures.

SELMA SELMAN

Bihać, Bosnia and Herzegovina, 1991

Superpositional Intersectionalism (2020)

Coloured pencils on paper, 40x50 cm and 50x60 cm.

Commissioned by Framer Framed. “I was just told by a scientist the other day that my drawings demonstrated the workings of a new physics that connects classical and quantum physics, “The Poised Realm,” in which all matter can be transformed into all other possible forms of matter. This possibility also applies to bodies, borders and drawings.”

Selma Selman was commissioned to produce a body of drawings related to her insight, quoted above. Her work seeks to map the Superpositional Intersectionalism of the body. Selman sees the possibility to integrate her plural representation of the body in transformation with today’s networked media culture while retaining the ethical demand made by the physical gaze.

“While I thoroughly understand and having physically lived through the genocidal violence referred to in this exhibition,” the artist writes, “I do not accept that the only possible ethical visual response to these spectrum of events is to produce another image of a man, a suffering victim, or an implied trace of violence.” Instead Selman aims to “dismantle the underlying mechanisms that produced the genocide, its history and the nation-state system and actualise egalitarian societies.”

Selman’s drawings seek to expose and neutralise perceived conceptual oppositions and contradictions in order to render the possibility built-in to all relations, spaces and times. Her drawings encourage the viewer to re-evaluate that which is assumed to be unchangeable, impossible or negotiable.
Selma Selman defines herself as an artist of Roma origins, and not a Romani artist, a subtle, yet critical distinction in her work. Her art embodies the struggles of her own life as well as her community, employing a plethora of media such as performance, painting, photography and video installations. Selman utilises her personal background as a lens through which she can understand the universal human condition and its idiosyncrasies.

HITO STEYERL

Munich, Germany, 1966
—

Journal No.1 - An Artist’s Impression (2007)
Digital video installation, colour/sound, 21”

Originally commissioned for documenta 12 and funded by Goethe-Institut, Germany.

Journal No.1 - An Artist’s Impression represents Steyerl’s attempt to reconstruct the first Bosnian newsreel. It was released in Sarajevo by Sutjeska Studio two years after the end of the Second World War in 1947. By the early 1990s only one nitrate copy survived in archival bunker adjacent to the studio’s headquarters. It was lost during the siege of Sarajevo in 1993, though exactly how is contested. Steyerl tries to piece this story together through interviews with people on the grounds of the bunker and the nearby house. Their testimony, recorded with a handheld camera, is interspersed with footage of the artist Arman Kulasić’s drawing what a man and a woman tell him about their memory of the newsreel. It was about a literacy class for Bosnians specifically focused on the alphabetisation of women. As they speak, contradicting each other, Kulasić sketches a classroom, the placement of the blackboard, a lightbulb descended from the ceiling, and Tito’s official portrait. As Steyerl’s twenty-minute, split screen video unfolds, it is revealed that the artist re-constituting the classroom scene is Muslim and that he narrowly escaped being interned in one of the concentration camp around Prijedor as a child.

Steyerl supplements witnesses’ testimony with footage from the fiction films Sutjeska also produced: a Yugoslav partisan film, Walter Saves Sarajevo (1972), by Hajrudin Kravac and Do You Remember Dolly Bell? (1981) by Emir Kusturica, a dramatic comedy set in Sarajevo in 1963—yet no attempt at reconstruction succeeds. Instead, memories of the war merge with each person’s attempt to re-image a fragment of lost Yugoslavia. As Bert Rebhandl writes of Journal No.1 - An Artist’s Impression, “Multiethnic Yugoslavia remains fragmentary, both in general history and the history of film, a country between the images.”


Hito Steyerl blends aspects of documentary with the film essay to explore globalisation, political economies, visual culture, and the status of art production. Through her writing practice, films, and performative lectures, Hito Steyerl considers the status of the image in an increasingly global and technological world. A particular theme of the Berlin-based artist’s work is the proliferation of images and how they inscribe and affect economy and culture on both a macro and micro scale.

FACING SREBRENICA PROJECT

Erna Rijsdijk and Guido Snel
—

Facing Srebrenica and the Future of Memory in Europe (2020 - 2025)
Research project presentation (photo slideshow, archive map and symposium).

Funded by Amsterdam Centre of European Studies - ACES - (UvA); Faculty of Military Studies (NLDA); Amsterdam School for Regional, Transnational and European Studies, Faculty of Humanities (UvA); Stichting Ondersteuning Veteranen Activiteiten; Post-Conflict Research Center Sarajevo; Global Digital Cultures (UvA).
Facing Srebrenica Project - Facing Srebrenica and the Future of Memory in Europe (2020)

Photo: Unknown Dutchbatter - Anera and Alaga Osmanović in Srebrenica 1994

Photo made available by Azir Osmanović
Researchers and Project Leaders:
Erna Rijsdijk and Guido Snel
Exhibition Advisor: Iris Sikking
Video Editor and Advisor: Tim Klaase
Research and Interviews in Bosnia and Herzegovina: Velma Šarić

Dutchbat soldiers took a large number of private photographs of the inhabitants of Srebrenica during their stay in the UN enclave (1994-1995) for their personal photo albums and sometimes on request of inhabitants. The Facing Srebrenica database and academic research project (2020-2025) is a response to a recent request by survivors of the Srebrenica genocide to facilitate access to those photos in order to find pictures of their loved ones and their own past. The photos serve as personal memory sites for both survivors and veterans. By collecting the photos and related narratives, and making them accessible in a permanent digital database, the project aims to bring these images of the people of Srebrenica "home".

In their search for the archive Erna Rijsdijk and Guido Snel explore the dialogic potential of the photographs and their importance for the future of memory of Srebrenica in Europe. From what will we reassemble ourselves marks the presentation of the initial phase of the Facing Srebrenica research and invites visitors to think along the ethical and political questions, and the potential history of archiving these visual memories.

Dr. Erna Rijsdijk is the initiator and project leader of Facing Srebrenica. Rijsdijk is a lecturer of military ethics and senior researcher at the Faculty of Military Sciences of the Netherlands Defence Academy. She studied politics, international relations and critical security studies and completed her PhD Thesis, Lost in Srebrenica: Responsibility and Subjectivity in the Reconstructions of a Failed Peacekeeping Mission at Vrije University, Amsterdam, in 2012. From 2000-2008 she was the chair of the Netherlands-Srebrenica Foundation, a Dutch NGO supporting Bosnian early returnees to Srebrenica with various small scale volunteer projects.

Dr. Guido Snel is a lecturer and senior researcher of European Studies at the Faculty of Humanities of the University of Amsterdam. Much of his academic research in the field of arts and literature focuses on trauma and loss in the aftermath of the Bosnian War. He is a writer of fiction and non-fiction and a prolific literary translator of Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian into Dutch. His most recent publications include the short story collection Huis voor het hiernamaals (de Arbeiderspers 2016) and the novel De mirreberg (de Arbeiderspers 2018).

CURATOR

Natasha Marie Llorens is a Franco-American independent curator and writer. A graduate of the MA program at the Center for Curatorial Studies at Bard, Llorens is currently finishing her Ph.D. at Columbia University. She is Professor of Art and Theory at the Royal Institute of Art in Stockholm and a Core Tutor at the Piet Zwart Institute in Rotterdam.
TEMPORARY MONUMENT: SREBRENICA IS DUTCH HISTORY

Temporary Monument: Srebrenica is Dutch history (2020)
—
By Bosnian Girl Collective
—
25 photos on billboards, 2 x 1.15 x 3.5 m
Date: 6th September - 18th October 2020
Location: Oranje-Vrijstaatkade, Amsterdam
Photography: Robin de Puy
Interviews: Chris Keulemans
Makeup: MUA Yokaw Pat
https://srebrenicaisdutchhistory.com/

Twenty-five years after the genocide in Srebrenica there is still no national monument in the Netherlands to commemorate this tragedy. In response to this lack, Bosnian Girl collective erected a Temporary Monument on Het Plein in The Hague on 11 July 2020, in front of the building where the Dutch government is seated, as part of their ‘Srebrenica is Dutch History’ campaign for the 25th-year commemoration of the genocide in Srebrenica. It will travel to Amsterdam and be shown outside Framer Framed in Amsterdam from 6th September to 18th October to coincide with the opening of the exhibition From what will we reassemble ourselves.

The installation consists of large format prints of twenty-five photographic portraits of twenty-five-year-old Bosnian Dutch women and men taken by Robin de Puy. While several were born in Srebrenica or elsewhere in Bosnia and Herzegovina—one was born during the week of the fall—some were born in the Netherlands. Their double identity symbolises the interconnectedness of Dutch and Bosnian history.

The caption of each image is a short text written by Chris Keulemans. Adnan, born in Den Haag, writes: “I work well with the Serbs in my company. But it is impossible for them to recognise the genocide. They know it, but don’t want to say it. I myself have been spending every holiday in Bosnia for years, to find my grandmother’s body. She died during the war in Srebrenica, but the question remains where?” Lejla, born in Srebrenica, writes: “My father and my uncle fled into the woods. Every night I was on the balcony as a baby to call out to my dad. Only a month later, he returned without my uncle. That is precisely why I think: you do not commemorate alone, but together.” Every image has a story and every story is twenty-five years old.

For the duration of their installation at Framer Framed, the large-scale photographs will be placed along the canal of Oranje-Vrijstaatkade, Amsterdam.
The work encompasses a temporary monument, a petition, and a political call for education on the history of Srebrenica to be included in the Dutch Canon.

Bosnian Girl Collective consists of four Bosnian-Dutch women: Arna Mačkić, Daria Bukvić, Emina Cerimović and Ena Sendijarević. Bosnian Girl campaigns for an inclusive historiography and commemoration of the Srebrenica genocide in the Netherlands. The name of the collective and the idea for the photographic form for Temporary Monument refers to the internationally renowned artwork Bosnian Girl by the Bosnian artist Šejla Kamerić. The work is a portrait of Kamerić taken by photographer Tarik Samarah overwritten with text from graffiti from the wall of the barracks in the UN base in Potočari where Dutch soldiers were stationed. “No teeth...? A mustache...? Smel like shit...? BOSNIAN GIRL!”

Robin de Puy (Netherlands, 1986) studied at the Fotacademie Rotterdam and sees the camera as an aid to understand the deeply personal traits and histories of each person, and how they also reveal something about herself. de Puy’s photographs are always imbued with a sensitivity and timelessness that encourages a slow gaze on the human condition. Her images are chances for genuine human connection, and through sharing with them with the world, allow us to take part in such moments.

Chris Keulemans (Tunis, 1960) is a writer, journalist, moderator and educator. Born in Tunis, Keulemans grew up in Baghdad, Iraq. He was one of the founders of the Tolhuistuin in Amsterdam, the previous location of Framer Framed, and fulfilled the role of Artistic Director until 2014. In 1984, he founded the literary bookshop Perdu in Amsterdam and previously worked at De Balie, Centre for culture and politics in Amsterdam, first as a curator, then later as director. He is well known for chairing debates and writing on the topics of art, engagement, migration and war.
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