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This preparatory reader aims at providing some basic information regarding various topics which will be raised and discussed in more detailed way during our forthcoming conference. These texts neither intend any presumption for the debates of the conference nor any limitation regarding the topics to be raised.

You will find in this reader:

I. An English version of Chapters 7 and 9 of Jovan Byford’s monograph on Staro Sajmište, which has recently been published in Serbian language. Those who are familiar with Serbian language and wish to read the entire book can download the electronic version of the original [HERE].

II. The shortened version of a research by Danijela Jovanović on the history of the Roma under German occupation of Serbia and especially with regard to the Sajmište camp.

III. A comprehensive study conducted by the City of Belgrade Department for Cultural Heritage regarding the Sajmište site.


V. A text by French historian Pierre Nora about the renaissance of remembrance in Europe.

VI. A text by German historian and director of the Sachsenhausen Memorial and Museum about the current debates on a Common European Culture of Remembrance.

VII. A Bibliography (not claiming to be complete)
Jovan Byford

Introduction

In the period between 1941 and 1944, nearly 20,000 people perished in the concentration camp at Sajmište, Belgrade. Located at the Belgrade Fair pavilions, on the left Sava riverbank, the Sajmište camp was the largest dungeon created by the occupation authorities in Serbia during World War II, but also one of the first Nazi camps in Europe for the mass internment of Jews. From December 1941 to March 1942, around 7,000 Jews, mostly women, children and the elderly (almost half of the pre-war Jewish population of the part of Serbia directly occupied by the German Reich in 1942) were brought to the Judenlager Semlin — the formal name of the Sajmište camp at the time. In only six weeks of the spring of 1942 they were all systematically murdered by the use of a lethal gas van. Shortly thereafter, Serbia was declared “Judenrein” — cleansed of Jews — and Sajmište was transformed into an Anhaltelager, a temporary detention camp for political prisoners, captured partisans and forced laborers. From the summer of 1942 to the camp’s disbandment in July 1944, around 32,000 prisoners (mostly Serbs) were brought to the Anhaltelager. Around one-third of them perished at the camp, mostly due to starvation or illness, or murdered by the guards and members of the camp administration. The others, following a brief stay at Sajmište, were transported as workforce to camps throughout the Third Reich, mainly in Germany and Norway.

Despite its significance as a site of unparalleled suffering and perishing, the Sajmište camp occupied a marginal place in the post-war social memory. In socialist Yugoslavia or later, competent institutions also failed to appropriately honor the victims of this camp or preserve their appropriate memory. Such neglectful attitude remained unchanged to this day. Even 65 years after the liberation, the largest individual Holocaust site in Serbia is not adequately organized or marked. Several remaining buildings of the former camp have been decaying for years and the entire Old Fairground complex survives today as a derelict and impoverished settlement with a few hundred families who maintain the dilapidated buildings and unpaved paths often at their own expense. Their neighborhood has, for decades, included several art ateliers, but also a series of business facilities – car repair shops, stores, warehouses and workshops – as well as a high school, tour-ist agency, bookshop, restaurant, even a small stage which has been the setting for rock concerts, boxing matches, theater plays and dances for about 10 years, despite increasing protests. Most of Belgrade citizens who cross the Sava River every day are not even aware that amidst the vegetation near today’s Brankov Bridge, on the New Belgrade side, there are buildings of the former camp. The fact that the very Sajmište represents a site of remembrance, is today indicated only by two abandoned and partially damaged memorial marks, one from the 1980s and the other from the 1990s, surviving as relics of unsuccessful and highly controversial attempts of memorialization of the previous decades.

This book, which came about as a result of the author’s long-lasting research project, is an attempt – in the year marking the 70th anniversary of the camp’s creation – to present for the first time the events from the Old Fairground since 1944 to this day and point out some of the causes of decades-long neglect of this historically important place. The post-war fate of the Old Fairground has not previously been the subject of a systematic scientific analysis and is mostly unknown to the broader public. The majority of print and electronic media reports in recent years create an impression that nothing was happening at Sajmište after World War II, i.e. that this site was simply relinquished to oblivion. For the most part, the post-1944 period can be reduced to several individual events, such as the arrival of youth brigades to Sajmište in 1948, establishment of the art colony in the 1950s, declaration of Sajmište as cultural heritage in the summer of 1987 or the inauguration of the monument in 1995. However, the recent history of the Old Fairground is much more complex and raises many interesting topics which have not yet been dealt with, concerning not only this site’s fate, but also the Yugoslav and later Serbian society’s attitude towards World War II, victims of Nazi camps and the Holocaust. For instance, it is largely unknown that the first initiative for the creation of a memorial site at Sajmište was launched in 1960. But why so belatedly, when bearing in mind that the State Commission for Investigating Crimes of the Occupying Forces characterized Sajmište as an important “place of torture of the Yugoslav people” as early as in 1946? Where were the victims of the Sajmište camp buried and were those sites ever marked? Why was the first memorial plaque placed at Sajmište only in 1974 and why was it later removed? Why was the Old Fairground, of all places, designated during the 1980s, after Tito’s death, as the setting for the main commemoration of the Day of Victory over Fascism in Belgrade? How and why was Sajmište fit into the dominant 1990s discourse about the suffering in Jasenovac and how did it become a site that should mark primarily the genocide in the NDH? Why were none of the initiatives for Sajmište’s development launched in the last 50 years fully carried out? What was the role of Sajmište in the post-war culture of Holocaust remembrance? What does Sajmište symbolize today and what is the attitude of the Serbian society and state, respectively, towards this place of suffering and perishing?

There will be an analysis of the post-war history of the Old Fairground from two equally important perspectives. The first one relates to Sajmište as a physical space. It occupies about 20 hectares of land at the left Sava riverbank, between the Brankov Bridge and the Stari Savski Bridge, i.e. today’s Block 17 of New Belgrade. Before the war, as well as during the period when it housed the camp, the Belgrade Fairground was on the periphery of the capital city, between with the river on one side and a swamp which divided Belgrade and Zemun, on the other. After the war, as a result of the development of New Belgrade, Sajmište found itself in the very city center, at part of the Sava riverbank connecting the old city with its new part. Therefore, it should come as no surprise that this site’s future was the subject of interest of experts in the fields of urban planning, architecture and spatial planning, as well as city and state officials who viewed its development (and still do) mainly from the perspective of urban and economic development of the capital city. On the other hand, in the 1960s Sajmište was recognized as an important symbolic space and site of historical significance. Its tragic fate then became the subject of remembrance that was official and institutionally-based, but not always widespread or public. The fate of the Old Fairground after 1944 was largely determined by the intersection of those perspectives — i.e. by the dispute, but also efforts to find a compromise between advocates of Sajmište as a memorial site and those who envisaged its different, primarily practical purpose.

Another level of complexity to the recent history of Sajmište is added by the fact that there had been no agreement in recent decades on what the main object of remembrance at the site should be, even among advocates of a memorial center or memorial park. In the last 65 years and particularly since the late 1980s, Sajmište was the subject of interest of various socio-political organiza-
tions, interest groups, individuals and public institutions that interpreted its past in different ways and according to their own respective discretion, points of view and current historical and political requirements, contemplating its future appearance and purpose accordingly. Consequently, one group considered Sajmište a symbol of the “revolutionary history of Belgrade”, resistance to fascism and suffering of the Yugoslav peoples, the other saw it as a Holocaust site, while the third one viewed Sajmište as the ideal location for commemorating the suffering of Serbs, Jews and Roma in the Ustasha NDH. In the recent period, the importance of pre-war Sajmište history was increasingly pronounced, recognizing the Belgrade Fair pavilions as a pearl of Yugoslav 1930s architecture and symbol of the then Belgrade economic elite’s entrepreneurship. Accordingly, Sajmište was an object of dispute during the entire post-war period – not only on whether it should be (exclusively) a memorial site, but on what was important to remember in the first place.

Debates on Sajmište as part of the Belgrade urban matrix and memorial site led in the past decades are important because they comprise an ideological and polemical context of today’s considerations of the site’s future development. Despite their pretentions to be new and original, most initiatives publically presented in recent years contain noticeable traces of all events at Sajmište and involving Sajmište from the end of World War II until today. One of consequences of this commonly overseen continuity in remembrance is the fact that most recent initiatives share numerous faults and omissions with the old ones. Hence, a better understanding of the post-war history of Sajmište, as well as clearer insight into past mistakes and reasons why they were never rectified, not only diminishes the prospect of repeating mistakes, but clearly indicates the necessity of finally stepping outside the framework of existing, deeply rooted beliefs (even delusions, one might say) about what the Old Fairground is or should be and finding a realistic solution for the site’s development, worthy of its victims.

An important topic that has to do with one of the major oversights in the majority of previous attempts of Sajmište’s memorialization is the manner in which this camp’s status as Holocaust site has been systematically neglected. In socialist Yugoslavia, the emphasis on partisans’ heroism and the common suffering of all Yugoslav peoples which dominated the remembrance of Sajmište overshadowed the specific nature of the Jews’ fate under Nazism. During the post-Yugoslav period, the emphasis on the common martyrdom of Serbs, Jews and Roma in the Independent State of Croatia – a subject routinely instrumentalized and misused by the nationalist elite in Serbia – but also the Milošević regime’s use of the motif of the Serbs’ resistance to the foreign conqueror, which was at the time politically functional, also distracted the public’s attention from the Jews’ tragic fate in Serbia. Of course, all this does not mean that during the last 65 years the suffering of Jews at Sajmište was completely forgotten or ignored – although, unfortunately there were such cases, as well. The destruction of Jews was being evoked as an integral part of the camp’s history, but never in a way that would mark Sajmište not only as a site of “Nazi terror” and the occupiers’ repressive policy against the People’s Liberation Struggle participants and civilians (including Jews) but also, quite specifically, as Holocaust site. In other words, the fact that Jews were not only the first victims of Sajmište, but the only category of the camp’s prisoners (and the only community in occupied Serbia) that perished as victim of calculated and total destruction – was never adequately admitted. The attitude towards the suffering of Jews at Sajmište dramatically illustrates the lack of consciousness in Serbia during the entire post-war period on the Holocaust as a specific historical event and unique example of human suffering, which by itself is worthy of attention and respect.
Jovan Byford

From a Site of Yugoslav Suffering to a Symbol of Serbian Martyrdom: Sajmište as the “Serbian Yad Vashem”

During the late 1980s, a time when organizations such as the Veterans’ Association and the Coordination Committee for Fostering Revolutionary Traditions promoted ideological motives and priorities as part of memorial activities at Sajmište, an alternative interpretation of World War II history began to emerge in the public discourse of Serbia. The new perspective did not only include new themes and a new focus – primarily the genocide in the Independent State of Croatia (NDH) between 1941 and 1945 – it also marked the beginning of a new culture of remembrance, with its own institutional basis and commemorative practice. The new culture of remembrance which was mainly advocated by the nationalist elite in Serbia also influenced the public perception of the Old Fairground and its tragic history.

In November 1988, midway between two spring ceremonies at Sajmište to celebrate the achievements of the People’s Liberation Struggle and Yugoslav unity, the Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts (SANU) held a conference entitled “Jasenovac 1945-1988.” It was organized by a special committee established as early as in 1984 following an initiative by Vladimir Dedijer and engendered in collecting “material on the genocide against Serbs and other Yugoslav peoples in the 20th century.” The Committee on Genocide (as it was called within SANU) was created as a result of an increasing belief among SANU historians that “no one in our country writes about genocide from a scientific point of view, let alone prints books containing historical data intended for the international public”. Besides, collecting material on genocide was a response to the fact that, according to Vladimir Dedijer, “serious international historians believe that the genocide in Yugoslavia is covered by a conspiracy of silence.” SANU endeavored to combat this conspiracy by identifying “Serbian, Slovenian, Jewish and Roma” victims of “genocide or political terror”, investigating sites of mass execution such as the “countless graves victims were thrown in” or “great sites of suffering such as Gradina within the Jasenovac complex” and gathering archival data on genocide which is “scattered throughout archives in the country” and abroad. Committee members appointed in 1984 included SANU members Vladimir Dedijer, Radovan Samardžić, Dobrica Cosić and Milorad Ekmeči, as well as two non-SANU historians – Andrej Mitrović and Branko Petranović. The Committee was later joined by Smilja Avramov and the self-proclaimed “Serbian Simon Wiesenthal” Milan Bulajić, who attended the 1986 trial of Ustasha criminal Andrija Artuković in Zagreb as an official SANU observer.

In its early stages, the Committee on Genocide adopted, at least publically, a pan-Yugoslav approach to the issue of genocide. Its members stressed the “necessity of all-Yugoslav activities”. On one occasion, Dobrica Cosić stated that “our work needs to be scientific, i.e. humane and democratic. Every mother’s pain, regardless of nationality, is equal and we must respect it”. The “pan-Yugoslav approach” to the issue of genocide was also noticeable in the efforts to prepare data on genocide “against all peoples of Yugoslavia”, including the 1943 crimes against Muslims in Eastern Bosnia.

The Committee’s first scientific gathering was held in 1986 with the intention to organize similar assemblies on an annual basis. However, already the following year, after the SANU Memorandum scandal, it was no longer possible to secure the necessary funding. Many members of the Committee deemed this a conspiracy, with the alleged involvement of the Security Service, the Vatican and anti-Serb Slovenian and Croatian politicians and their “pawns” in Serbia (the “Stambolić dynasty” in particular). They all allegedly joined forces to obstruct the Committee’s work and continue to conceal crimes, primarily those against Serbs in the NDH.

It soon became clear that despite its original “all-Yugoslav” orientation, the Committee on Genocide represents a significant element of the emerging wave of Serbian nationalism, in the development of which SANU played an important role. The Committee and prominent members of the SANU Department of Historical Sciences have contributed to the preoccupation with genocide in NDH reaching the level of obsession in Serbia as early as in the second half of 1988. Such role of the Committee became even more distinct following Dedijer’s death in November 1990 when the helm was taken over by representatives of an extremely nationalist wing – SANU member Radovan Samardžić and his deputy Milan Bulajić. “Previously appointed members who are no longer active in the Committee for various reasons” were gradually excluded from membership. The Committee was instead replaced by persons from outside SANU who dealt exclusively with the suffering of Serbs, including Archimandrite (and future Bishop) Atanasije Jevtić, Srboljub Zivanović, Dragolje Lučić, Duro Zatezalo, et al. It established ties with the Serbian Orthodox Church, jointly organizing an action in 1991 to exhume graves and sites of mass executions in Croatia and Bosnia. In a word, the Committee on Genocide gradually became a means to combat the policy of “organized oblivion” of Serbian suffering in NDH with an openly propagandistic mission. Genocide in other parts of Yugoslavia (particularly the one against Muslims in Eastern Bosnia in 1943) was not being mentioned, let alone investigated, by anyone.

The Committee’s emerging, increasingly nationalist orientation and its focus on Serbian victims was reflected by the conference “Jasenovac 1945-1988”. One of its main topics was the manipulation with the number of Jasenovac victims. Milan Bulajić, the Committee’s spokesperson of sorts, insisted that the exact number of this camp’s victims was never determined, which was actually true. However, his statement insinuated that the official estimate of between 500,000 and 700,000 victims based on the findings of the State Commission for War Crimes was probably too low. Besides, the alleged “conspiracy of silence” could not have been aimed at augmenting the number of victims, but rather the opposite – concealing the true scope of Serb suffering in the NDH, which many at the time believed to have had surpassed one million victims.

As a response to “manipulations” with Jasenovac in official Yugoslav historiography, Milan Bulajić proposed a project with the goal to finally break the “taboo” about this camp, oppose the “ban on determining the number of World War II victims” and enable the truth about Serbian victims in World War II to emerge in the public discourse of Serbia. The new perspective did not only include new themes and a new focus – primarily the genocide in the Independent State of Croatia (NDH) between 1941 and 1945 – it also marked the beginning of a new culture of remembrance, with its own institutional basis and commemorative practice. The new culture of remembrance which was mainly advocated by the nationalist elite in Serbia also influenced the public perception of the Old Fairground and its tragic history.

2 See “Pismo Vladmira Dedijera Izvršnom odboru SANU”, ibid, p. 499.
3 Ibid, p. 503.
5 Dragović-Soso, Jana, Saviours of the Nation, op. cit., p. 113.
Croatia to be presented to the world at last. The project was to include the creation of “a database of genocide victims […] which would be set up through use of modern computer technology” and realized by a separate institution – the “Museum of Genocide Victims”, Bulajić believed that this museum should be established as soon as possible, in order for the truth about the number of victims in NDH to see the light of day by the scheduled 1991 marking of the 50th anniversary of what he called the Yugoslav “Holocaust-genocide” or “Yugoslav Holocaust”.7

Bulajić’s initiative to create the Museum of Genocide was immediately accepted by a wide spectrum of the Serbian nationalist elite, especially after Franjo Tuđman’s revisionist book Bespuća povijesne zbiljnosti (Wastelands of Historical Reality) was published in May 1989. In early 1990, Svet magazine (Ljiljana Bulatović was Editor-in-Chief at the time) supported Bulajić’s campaign to create a “museum of genocide, like the one built by the Jews in Jerusalem a long time ago”.8

In February 1990, Svet hosted a round-table discussion to expose the strategy of “organized oblivion” of Serbian victims of Ustasha genocide and deny Croatian nationalists’ assertions that there had been only 40,000 Jasenovac victims. This discussion marked the official initiative to create the Museum of Genocide Victims, supported by Milan Bulajić as representative of the SANU Committee on Genocide, as well as by the Serbian-Jewish Friendship Society and the Archives of Serbia.

The Serbian-Jewish Friendship Society’s support to this project should come as no surprise. The Society was founded in 1988 by a group of Serbian and Jewish public personalities to promote good relations between the two peoples, as well as between the states of Serbia and Israel. However, its work was primarily in the purpose of nationalist propaganda. Representatives of the Society often compared the fate of the Jews during Nazism with the fate of the Serbs, thus boosting the motif of Serbian martyrdom which represented a focal point of the late 1980s Serbian nationalist discourse. It is important to stress that the Federation of Jewish Communities in Yugoslavia never officially accepted the Serbian-Jewish Friendship Society and that the latter was never an organ of the Federation. Moreover, many members of the Jewish community in Serbia have openly criticized the Society’s activities, describing it as a “functionalization” of Jews and their history, motivated by propagandistic causes.9 This, however, did not prevent the Society’s Jewish members from occasionally acting as representatives of the wider community, which is how they were accepted, particularly by the nationalist circles.

The idea of the Museum of Genocide Victims was later also backed by Radovan Samardžić who believed that the SANU Committee on Genocide was slowly turning into a diminishing group of disenchanted “pensioners” and that its work should be resumed by a special institution supported by the state, which would “dispose of expert services and [better] technical equipment”.10

The February 1990 round-table discussion also raised the question about the museum’s location. Milan Bulajić proposed that the museum – which, at times, he eerily called the “Museum of the Dead” – should be located at “a site of remembrance of the Nazi Sajmište camp in Belgrade”. The idea was immediately accepted by other participants including Klara Mandić, delegate of the Serbian-Jewish Friendship Society at this gathering Mandić described the Sajmište museum as the future “Serbian Yad Vashem which would document the fact that the Serbian people is one of history’s greatest genocide victims”.11

When selecting the location for the future museum of Serbian suffering, Klara Mandić or any other participants of this discussion failed to consider the history of Sajmište and there were no attempts to in any way justify the idea of establishing the Museum of Genocide Victims at this location, of all places, Sajmište was undoubtedly selected for it was a site of suffering (a Nazi camp) which had been proclaimed cultural heritage a few years prior. However, during the discussion about the Museum of Genocide, Sajmište was only considered as a location, an empty symbolic and geographic space deprived of characteristics and its own tragic past. At the same time, the victims of Sajmište – including those murdered in the gas van in the spring 1942 – were effectively excluded from this location’s history, yielding their place to a new memorial site dedicated to Serb victims of the Ustasha genocide.

The idea to create the Museum of Genocide Victims was also supported by Serbian authorities. In November 1990, Bulajić, accompanied by SANU Vice President Antonije Isaković, visited Slobodan Milosević, presenting him the initiative to set up the Museum of Genocide Victims. Afterwards, Bulajić announced that the President “gave his full support”.12 Shortly thereafter, Milan Bulajić was appointed president of a City Assembly committee in charge of developing Sajmište. As part of a call to raise funds for the completion of the monument by Popović, sent in April 1991 to, inter alia, the Federation of Jewish Communities in Yugoslavia and branches of the Serbian-Jewish Friendship Society in the country and abroad, this committee announced that Sajmište would become the center of the Museum of Genocide Victims which will study and preserve “the truth about the genocide committed against Serbs, Jews and Roma”.

The decision to build the Museum of Genocide Victims at Sajmište was made at a December 1991 City Assembly meeting attended by Milan Bulajić (on behalf of the SANU Committee on Genocide), Boško Novaković, representing former Sajmište inmates and representatives of the Institute of Urbanism, City Secretariat for Culture, Republic Institute for the Protection of Cultural Monuments and the Jewish community. Although several possible locations (including the Museum “25. maj”) were proposed at the time, the fact that Boško Novaković was invited to take part indicates that Sajmište was the “frontrunner” even prior to the meeting. The official proposal to proclaim Sajmište the location of the Museum of Genocide Victims came from the Republic Institute for the Protection of Cultural Monuments. This institution characterized Sajmište as the site of the “largest Belgrade camp/site of mass execution in World War II”.13 Still, the meeting’s participants agreed that the establishment of the Museum was far-fetched since it had to be preceded by the relocation of Sajmište’s current inhabitants and a long and expensive process of restoration. It was decided that the Museum was to be established immediately, but that it would engage primarily in research work until the development of Sajmište. Only a few days after this meeting, the Draft Law on the Establishment of the Museum of Genocide Victims formally en-

---

7 “Okrugli sto - Muzej žrtava genocida”, Svet, April 1 1990, p. 5.
8 Ibid, p. 3.
11 Bokić, A. "Srbi ne znaju koliko ih nema" Svet, April 1 1990, p. 65.
tered the adoption procedure of the People’s Assembly of the Republic of Serbia.\textsuperscript{14}

\textbf{Sajmište as “Part of the Wider Circle of Death” around Jasenovac}

The Old Fairground’s appeal as site of the future Museum of Genocide Victims was mainly based on its rather large surface, central position on the left bank of the Sava River, not far from the city center, as well as the fact that it had already been designated for development as a memorial complex. However, events took an unexpected turn in the summer of 1992. During a July parliamentary debate on the law on the museum’s establishment, the then Speaker of Assembly Aleksandar Baković included at the last moment (apparently by mistake) an amendment by Kragujevac deputy Dragoslav Petrović, which specified this city as its location, as it was the site of a mass execution of civilians in October 1941.\textsuperscript{15} To the surprise of the majority of People’s Assembly of Serbia deputies and the despair of Milan Bulajić (who was envisaged as the institution’s director from the very beginning), the law was passed, “moving the Museum of Genocide Victims to Kragujevac by an administrative decision.”\textsuperscript{16} In the following years, Bulajić intensively campaigned to rectify this “mistake”, believing that a museum of such importance should be located in the Serbian capital which, after all, already keeps “significant archival data required by the museum”.\textsuperscript{17} However, the law was never changed. Bulajić did not accept a compromise until 1995: the Museum was formally registered in Kragujevac while its research base was set up in temporary facilities at Nikola Pašić Square, Belgrade.

In his efforts to present Sajmište as the most solutionable for the future Museum of Genocide Victims and a site of a memorial center dedicated primarily to victims of Ustaša terror, Milan Bulajić’s work and public appearances at the time often emphasized the connection between Sajmište and Jasenovac. This is rather significant because until then, save for the conclusion of Communiqué No. 87 by the State Commission for Investigating Crimes of the Occupying Forces and their Helpers of Communiqué No. 87 by the State Commission for Investigating Crimes of the Occupying Forces and their Helpers which lists the Ustasha Ante Pavelić and Dido Kvaternik among persons responsible for the crimes at the Zemun camp, Sajmište was not known as part of NDH history. Hence, there was no obvious logic behind Bulajić’s proposal to build the Museum of Genocide Victims at this location. In order to change this situation, Bulajić advocated an interpretation of Sajmište which was selective and often not based on historical facts, with the aim to “export” the camp to the Independent State of Croatia, present it as its legacy and thus connect it with Jasenovac, the cornerstone of the future Museum of Genocide Victims. This strategy emphasized several rather peripheral aspects of the Sajmište camp’s history, tendentiously stressing carefully selected individual cases of its victims’ suffering.

Only a month after the establishment of the Museum of Genocide Victims, Milan Bulajić, speaking at a SANU meeting, presented two reasons why this museum should be located in Belgrade, specifically at Sajmište. Firstly, Bulajić, stated, “bodies from the Independent State of Croatia, from the Ustaša death camp ‘Jasenovac’ were floating to the banks of the Belgrade Sava River” symbolically connecting the Serbian capital, particularly its river banks, with Jasenovac. Secondly, the Sajmište “innates were de-

\begin{enumerate}
\item[16] The parliamentary debate included a discussion about the museum’s name. Eventually, it was decided that the institution would be named Museum of Genocide Victims.
\end{enumerate}

— Joran Byford

\textit{From a Site of Yugoslav Suffering to …}

18 Ibid, pp. 21-22. In his books Bulajić regularly included the map of NDH, with arrows showing the inflow of inmates to Jasenovac from other camps. One of the arrows led to Sajmište.
19 See Koljanin, Milan, Nemački logor na Beogradskom sajmištu, op. cit., p. 51.

19 Bulajić saw those four claims as proof that during World War II Sajmište was, in fact, “a part of a wider circle of the Nazi Ustaša Jasenovac death camp system”. The Jasenovac camp itself was only the “first circle” of death, the nearby smaller Ustaša camps represented the “second circle”, while the third and widest circle encompassed the “entire territory of the Ustaša Independent State of Croatia (NDH)” including the Sajmište camp.\textsuperscript{22} It is important to point out that each of Bulajić’s four arguments contains a grain of truth. It is true that Sajmište was formally located on the territory of the Independent State of Croatia whose eastern border was at the left bank of the Sava River in Belgrade. It is true that a group of inmates was transported from NDH to Sajmište. However, after declaring them “incapable of work”, the Germans returned the inmates to the Ustaša who then executed them at Jasenovac. Victims’ bodies from NDH did float all the way to Belgrade in 1941 and Ustaša did take over the command of the Sajmište camp in May 1944. However, all that does not render Bulajić’s conclusions correct. During its entire existence, Sajmište was exclusively a Nazi camp and segment of history of the part of Serbia directly occupied by Nazi Germany, rather than NDH. The agreement between the German command in Belgrade and the Zagreb authorities was a formality and the camp was guarded only by German soldiers subordinated to the German authorities in Serbia until May 1944. Also, the fate of the inmates who were returned to the Ustaša by no means justifies the claim that Sajmište was part of the Jasenovac camp system.\textsuperscript{23} The number of inmates who were returned to NDH was not only relatively small in comparison with the total number of Sajmište victims, but its tendentious accentuating serves to distract from the fact that a much higher number of exhausted and “incapable” inmates were arrested on the territories of Croatia and Bosnia and then executed or left to die of hunger or illness at Sajmište by German guards or members of the camp administration. Bulajić, on the other hand, presents the case of transporting inmates to Jasenovac in September 1942 as the central event in the history of Sajmište, establishing a symbolic connection between this camp and the Serbs’ suffering in the NDH. As for the bodies which floated to Belgrade, their actual number (around four hundred) was much lower than the 15.000 stated by Bulajić in his books. Besides, it is indicative that there had been an initiative prior to 1992 to raise a monument in Belgrade to the victims of NDH genocide whose bodies floated to Belgrade – however, not at Sajmište, but near the Neboja Tower or at Ada Ciganlija, sites where many of the bodies were originally buried. Obviously, Bulajić later amalgamated this idea with the initiative to establish the Museum of Genocide Victims through his efforts to form the strongest ties possible between Sajmište and the genocide in NDH.
Finally, there is no truth to Bulajić’s claim that the period between May and July 1944 when the camp was taken over by the Ustasha was a time of particular brutality. Bulajić states that under the leadership of camp administrator Petar Brzica—who was “sent to this duty from Jasenovac after winning a prisoner-slaying contest”—inmates were “beaten to death” by the Ustasha more often than it was the case under German administration.22 However, Milan Kolfanin (whose research Bulajić often cites when writing about Sajmište) claims that during the last months of the camp’s existence, its policy was milder in comparison with the time when it was under German command and held a much higher number of inmates. Besides, even after being taken over by the Ustasha, Sajmište was never a “Ustasha” camp like Jasenovac. Even in the period between May and July 1944, Sajmište inmates were primarily “prisoners of the Germans” and people “the German police … counted on for sending to the Reich as work force”.24

Despite pointing out ties between Sajmište and Jasenovac, Milan Bulajić still did not completely forget the former’s status of a “Nazi creation and site of Jewish suffering” on the territory of occupied Serbia.23 In his books, Bulajić occasionally quotes Christopher Browning’s important work on Sajmište and mentions the gas van used to destroy Jewish inmates in the spring of 1942. Hence, he does not completely redraw Sajmište’s history or discard the Holocaust of Serbian Jews. However, at the same time, the scientific facts on the *Judenlager* are rather peripheral in Bulajić’s entire narrative about World War II genocide.25 Just as in previous decades, Jews were identified as the first (but not particularly important) victims of Sajmište. Furthermore, in his public appearances Bulajić “remembered” the Jewish aspect of Sajmište’s history most commonly in the presence of Jews or when the local or international Jewish community was expected to donate to the Museum of Genocide Victims project. This was the case with a call for donations addressed by the Committee for the Development of Sajmište to the Federation of Jewish Communities and the Serbian-Jewish Friendship Society in April 1991. Although the appeal states the Museum of Genocide Victims and remembrance of suffering of “Serbs, Jews and Roma” in Croatia as the main purpose of the future memorial complex at Sajmište, it still strategically places Sajmište in the context of the Holocaust in Serbia: the call for funds begins with the presentation of Sajmište as a site where a significant part of the Jewish community in Serbia was destroyed in the gas van. In the following years, Bulajić regularly used the same strategy of selective and functionalized memory in his fundraising activities. The fact that “Sajmište was a Belgrade Nazi camp where the notorious gas vans were used” would suddenly become relevant when the Israeli government or international Jewish organizations were asked to donate to the Museum of Genocide Victims at Sajmište.

The Serbo-Croatian Propaganda War and Interpretations of Sajmište’s History

The interpretation of Sajmište and its history was certainly influenced by the early 1990s polemics between Zagreb and Belgrade about the Serbs’ and Croats’ respective attitude towards Jews. On the Croatian side, the most active participants in what appeared to be a war of words included authors like Tomislav Vuković, Ljubica Stefan, Josip Pečaric, Ante Knežević and the American author Philip Cohen.27 In their work, they attempted to present the Serbs as the true “genocidal people” whose collaborationists, with the blessing of the Serbian Orthodox Church, committed crimes during World War II much more terrible then the ones by the Ustasha in the NDH and cleansed Serbia of Jews. The aforementioned authors claimed that during the post-war period there was a “conspiracy of silence” concealing the genocidal character of Serbian nationalism and covering its bloody traces. During this debate, the Croatian side amply borrowed (and twisted) the arguments of their Serbian counterparts who were the first to write about the “conspiracy of silence”, genocidal nature of (Croatian) nationalism, role of the (Catholic) church in the World War II genocide, and so forth. On the Serbian side, the main actors included Milan Bulajić, along with authors of the book *Istina a "srpskom antesismitizmu"* (*The Truth about "Serbian Antisemitism"*) Andrija Gams and Aleksandar Levi, and Jaša Almuli, one of the Serbian-Jewish Friendship Society’s spokespersons.28 Their response to the “accusations” from Zagreb was mostly aimed at fully denying the existence of antisemitism in Serbia, thereby emphasizing its widespread presence in Croatia, both in the past and today.

The ministries of information of Serbia and Croatia, as well as regime-controlled media, quickly backed this debate proving that it was actually led on the level of state propaganda. Also, the works by the aforementioned authors were regularly translated and published, in parts or integrally, in the English language, which points out that they were not only intended for the domestic public, but for the international public opinion, as well: in Croatia as part of the PR project to clean up the history of NDH and in Serbia for the purpose of boosting the country’s image in the world.29 Alone the fact that the attitude towards Jews became this significant in both countries’ international propaganda is interesting and could be, at least to some extent, attributed to both sides’ belief in the power of the Jewish public opinion in America, although this was perhaps not the case with individual authors.30

The early 1990s debates are significant for this book’s subject because from the very beginning Sajmište was one of the main arenas of the battle between Serbian and Croatian quasi–historians. It is impossible to determine who “started it”, but as early as in the late 1980s, authors in Serbia began increasingly to use the argument that Sajmište was located on the territory of NDH. In most cases, the intention was not to “frame” Croatia with the camp’s victims, but to point out that the Serbian collaborationist authorities had no influence over the incidents at the camp. Some authors claimed that, since Sajmište was under German administration and on another state’s territory, the Nedić government in Belgrade cannot be held responsible for the Holocaust. This was not a new argument,
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24 Kolfanin, Milan, Nemacki logor na Beogradskom sajmištu, op. cit., p. 443.
26 Bulajić, Milan, Jasenovac: uloga Vatikana u nacističkoj Hrvatskoj, op. cit., p. 11.
29 See MacDonald, David Bruce, Balkan holocausts? Serbian and Croatian victim-centred propaganda and the war in Yugoslavia, Manchester, Manchester University Press, 2002.
for it was used by the collaborationists themselves during their trials after the war.44 However, it was reintroduced to the public discourse in the late 1980s as part of the narrative about the impeccable tradition of the Serbian-Jewish friendship and with the aim to divert public attention from the Nedić government’s role in enforcing anti-Jewish measures during the early stages of the occupation—requisition of Jewish property, internment of Jews in Topovske šupe and Banjica camps and so forth.45 However, soon thereafter, the standpoint emerged that Sajmište’s location on the territory of NDH was a confirmation that it was an Ustasha camp. As early as in 1990, an article published by the Politika daily mentioned Sajmište along with Jasenovac and Jadovno as a site of Ustasha crime against Serbs, Jews and Roma.37

Croatian authors responded to those claims with a counterattack. Besides denying the claim that Sajmište was an Ustasha camp (especially during the time when it was a Jewish camp), they aimed to prove that the Serbs were actually the most brutal murderers at the camp. Their works created the impression that only the outside perimeter of the camp was secured by the Germans, while the Serbian authorities had control within the camp. In their book Pregled srpskog antisemitizma ([Review of Serbian Antisemitism]), Tomislav Vuković and Edo Bojović promoted Radivoje Kisić, the notorious capo at the Anhaltelager, to a “Yugoslav [sic!] commander of the camp”, while other capos were referred to as Serbian “policemen.”34

The murdering of Jews at the camp was attributed to “Serbian-German allies”. In her book Srpska pravoslavna crkva i fašizam (Serbian Orthodox Church and Fascism) Ljubica Štefan also claims that Sajmište was “administered by Germans and Milan Nedić’s Serbian police, led by Dragi Jovanović.”35

Croatian authors presented those previously unknown “facts” about Sajmište as significant discoveries concealed by the “conspiracy of silence” during the past decades. Štefan states that the truth about Sajmište was previously concealed with the intention of presenting Serbia as “pure and innocent” in regard to the Holocaust, while putting all the blame on Croatia. In this context, Štefan brings up an argument identical to the one we find in the literature on Jasenovac published in Belgrade at the time: “liberators”, i.e. Partisans are accused of consciously destroying any trace of this scene of crime, by someone’s orders and as a result, the Sajmište camp was “erased from history — intentionally, systematically.”46 The fact that after the war “there had never, absolutely never been a commemoration [at Sajmište]” which, of course, was not true, was also contributed to the conspiracy.37

Another issue which made Sajmište particularly attractive for the Croatian propaganda was the fact that by a simple game of numbers it could be presented not only as the Serbian equivalent to Jasenovac, but as a scene of much worse suffering than the largest camp in the NDH. For example, in his book Srpski mit o Jasenovcu (Serbian Myth about Jasenovac), Josip Pećarić refers to the findings of the State Commission for Investigating Crimes of the Occupying Forces and their Helpers which determined that there were “more than 40,000 victims” at Sajmište. Besides, he states that the actual number of victims was probably even higher, since the Yugoslav authorities allegedly intentionally reduced the number of Jewish victims at Sajmište, which actually surpasses 11,000. However, Pećarić is not nearly as prone to believe the findings of the Commission or the literature from the period of socialist Yugoslavia in regard to the number of Jasenovac victims. On the contrary, a significant part of his book aims to prove that the number of Jasenovac victims was, in fact, much lower than the alleged 600,000 and that Tudman was more or less right when claiming that the number of victims was only around 40,000. It is not difficult to see where this argument leads. When comparing the maximum estimates of the suffering at Sajmište with the numbers regarding Jasenovac we find in Croatian revisionist literature, it turns out that Sajmište was a larger camp than Jasenovac. Hence, it turns out that the biggest crime on the territory of Yugoslavia was committed in Belgrade, rather than in the NDH. Consequently, the efforts by Croatian authors to prove that Serbia was not “pure and innocent” regarding the Holocaust quickly grew into a campaign to show that Serbia was in fact the main culprit in the Balkan Holocaust, which was previously unknown due to the systematic “concealing of truth about Belgrade concentration camps.” Ljubica Štefan even insinuates that Croatia was a victim of injustice when Jasenovac was included among the 22 camps in the remembrance mosaic in Yad Vashem, Israel, claiming that Sajmište deserves a place on that list instead.

Mutual accusations of “genocidal nature” which in both cases implied manipulations with historical facts, raised tensions on both sides during the 1990s, stirring nationalist passions, negative emotions and a sense of embitterment in the public, which was the purpose of such debates in the context of war propaganda in the first place. Unfortunately, some of the arguments gradually became deeply rooted both in Serbia and Croatia. In discussions about the Holocaust in Serbia, many issues are still being explained and justified by the claim that “Sajmište was in the NDH.” To this day, there are persons in Croatia who believe that there had been a Belgrade camp comparable to Jasenovac in terms of the number of victims and terrors and that, accordingly, the NDH was not a unique evil in the Yugoslav context. However, a matter of particular significance for the remembrance of Sajmište is the fact that, through debates with their Croatian “colleagues”, Bulajić and like-minded persons gradually refined their arguments about Sajmište as part of NDH history, thus growing increasingly convinced that this site can only be the scene of a memorial center dedicated to Serbian suffering in Croatia.48

Finally, it is interesting to point out the significance of a photograph of Sajmište inmates published after the war by the State Commission for Investigating Crimes of the Occupying Forces and their Helpers in the debate between Bulajić and the Croatian authors. In the summer of 1994, the Museum of Genocide Victims, in cooperation with the Museum of Vojvodina, organized an exhibition entitled “Jasenovac: System of Ustasha Death Camps” in Belgrade and Novi Sad and later outside Serbia, as well.49 The exhibits, consisting mostly of gruesome photographs showing Serbian suffering in the NDH, included one of a dismembered inmate at the Todt Organization temporary detention camp located at the confluence of Sava into the Danube, in the immediate vicinity of Sajmište. This
was a “branch” of Sajmište which interned inmates capable of work before they were sent to work in Germany or Norway. During the 1994 exhibition, but also later, a caption stated that the picture shows “famished Jasenovac inmates”. 40

This photograph provoked Josip Pečarić into a debate with Bulajić. The former claimed that it was an “intentional” mistake and an attempt of “planting” victims from occupied Serbia to Croatia. However, this is unlikely. If this was the true motive of the exhibit’s organizers, the persons in the photograph would not have been described as Jasenovac inmates but, on the contrary, as prisoners of Sajmište. Namely, if the photograph caption at an exhibition about the suffering in the NDH had read “famished inmates of Sajmište”, one could rightfully claim that this was a intentional attempt to falsify history and mark Sajmište as a site of genocide in the NDH. This way, even though it is an unforgivable oversight by the exhibition’s author, it was more likely a mistake. Still, the entire “famished inmates of Jasenovac” episode becomes more significant when taking into account the fact that this was not the first time a photograph from Sajmište was attributed to a different camp. In the 1970 book Otpor golorukih kroz logore (Resistance of Barehanded through Camps), an almost identical picture taken from the same collection was published to illustrate the suffering – at Banjica.41

It is quite possible that in both cases the cause for the incorrect caption of the photograph was the same. Namely, both during the socialist period and the 1990s, the predominant culture of remembrance in Serbia favored certain sites of suffering. At first, Banjica was at the center of attention as a site symbolizing the plight of NOB (People’s Liberation Struggle) supporters in Serbia. This role was later assumed by Jasenovac which became a metonymy for the plight of Serbs in the NDH. In both cases, despite the fact that it was the largest camp in occupied Serbia, Sajmište was a “second-rate camp”. After all, when Banjica received its first memorial plaque in 1961 during the planning of the 20th anniversary of the uprising, there were no funds for Sajmište. During the 1980s, when Sajmište and Jajinci were to be developed, priority was given to the latter, inter alia because it was the location of Banjica inmates’ sufferin When during the 1990s Jasenovac was recognized as a symbol of Serbian martyrdom in World War II, the idea to establish a museum dedicated to the history of Sajmište was entirely secondary to the initiative of establishing a museum commemorating victims of genocide in the NDH. This is the context in which the controversial use of photographs should be interpreted, both in 1970 and 1994. The motifs of suffering at Banjica and later at Jasenovac were at the time so dominant that the editors of the book Otpor golorukih kroz logore (Resistance of Barehanded through Camps) and organizers of the exhibition on Jasenovac – who were obviously not well familiar with the provenance of individual pictures – automatically assimilated photographs of “famished inmates” into the narrative of a camp that was at the time considered a paradigm of human sufferin Hence, neither case probably represents an intentional manipulation but a simple consequence of the fact that Sajmište was overshadowed by other camps during the entire post-war period.

Distribution of Memorial Sites in Belgrade: the Old Fairground and “Menorah in Flames”

In the period when the Museum of Genocide Victims was being established, just like during the 1980s, most of the decisions on the future of Sajmište and its purpose were made without the involvement of the Jewish community’s officials. Jewish Community of Belgrade was notified about different proposals and decisions but mostly informally, through Spiro Solomun who was at the time a City of Belgrade Secretariat for Culture official, or by occasional communication with Milan Bulajić. However, opinions of the Serbian Jews were not seriously considered in regard to the development of Sajmište.

Such a situation is somewhat strange considering the fact that certain members of the Jewish community in Serbia described this period (1989-1991) as a “good period for the Jews”. This “good period” was marked by what seemed to be an increased interest about different aspects of Jewish history and culture, as well as increased visibility of Jews in public life, mostly through the Serbian-Jewish Friendship Society. As part of its public activities, the Society has initiated or at least publicly supported the raising of several monuments to Jewish victims of Nazism, for example at Dorćol, Belgrade, in Kragujevac, Šabac and Zasavica. This means that the suffering of Serbian Jews had received increased publicity at the time, beyond the confines of the Jewish community.

How can one explain the obvious inconformity between the public preoccupation with the plight of the Jews as promoted by the Serbian-Jewish Friendship Society and the near-total exclusion of the Jewish community from the decision-making process on the future of Sajmište? How come the sculpture “Menorah in Flames” by Nandor Gidid, revealed in a solemn state inauguration at the Danube bank in the fall of 1990 was promoted as a symbol of the Serbs’ and Jews’ common remembrance of the Holocaust, while there was no trace of “common remembrance” at Sajmište? The answer to this question lies mainly in the fact that the alleged “pro-Jewish euphoria” in Serbia was neither particularly strong nor comprehensive.42 It inspired the raising of new monuments, such as the one in Dorćol, with important contributions from persons close to the Serbian-Jewish Friendship Society, with the object of remembrance created carefully and strategically in the spirit of the interpretation of Serbian-Jewish relations as promoted by this Society at the time. Namely, despite the fact that they were dedicated to Jewish victims, new monuments usually attracted media attention because they were viewed (or, rather, presented to the public) mainly as a sign of lasting Serbian sympathy for the Jews. “Menorah in Flames”, for example, was immediately interpreted not only as a monument to Jews murdered in the Holocaust, but also as a recognition of Serbian “openness” and a place which would preserve the memory of Serbian and Jewish common martyrdom’s history.43 However, this way of looking at the past did not reach the existing memorial sites such as Sajmište, which already had a developed and institutionally based commemorative practice. The narrative about the inseparable bonds between Serbs and Jews was not that easy to fit in the interpretation of Sajmište at the time by, for instance, former Sajmište inmates.

Furthermore, the raising of Gidid’s monument in Dorćol in 1990 coincided with the early stages of the campaign to establish the Museum of Genocide Victims, leading to unforeseen consequences for Sajmište. It was a period of a highly questionable, although informal distribution of memorial sites in the city. The Danube Quay monument which honored Jewish victims of Nazism de facto “relieved” Sajmište of its commitment to become a monument of Holocaust victims. Since the Jews were deemed appropriately honored with the “Menorah in Flames” sculpture, Sajmište received the “freedom” of becoming a site to honor other victims – mainly the Serbs – in the Museum of Geno-
tions the organization of “exhibiting technical equipment, particularly electronics and informatics”, as well as the possibility of allocating a part of the space to “trade, tourism, business, i.e. commercial contents”.46 The Plan’s authors even believed that Sajmište should be functionally connected with the Intercontinental business and hotel complex. Also, the Plan stressed Sajmište’s role as an art colony and the necessity of expanding and restoring the existing “contents of culture and arts”.

The emphasis on the “semi-functional character” and the total reconstruction of Sajmište is important because it illustrates the extent to which architects and urban planners of the late 1980s and early 1990s began to “remember” the pre-war period and recognize the historical importance of the Belgrade Fair, not only in terms of Yugoslav architecture, but the city’s economic life, as well. As recently announced by Vesna Matičević, who was in charge of the Detailed Urban Plan’s drafting from 1987 to 1992, the original aim of the study was “expanded”, since “it was also proven necessary to mark the time when the Fair existed”, but also the “period after the camp was disbanded”, i.e. the art colony. In other words, the essence of the “memorial complex” underwent major changes between 1987 when Sajmište was proclaimed cultural heritage and 1992 when the urban plan was adopted.47

Furthermore, a detailed analysis of the urban plan shows that this “expansion” significantly diminished the original emphasis on Sajmište as a memorial site. This is represented by the fact that the majority of contents related to the remembrance of the camp were noticeably neglected, i.e. relocated from the Sajmište complex itself. There had been plans to erect a monument to the victims in the coastal part, at the periphery of the former camp. The same area was allocated for new structures which would house the museum. There were plans for a separate memorial dedicated to Jewish victims, which was to comprise of two green groves, according to the “tradition of the Jewish people”. This memorial which isolates and in a way “ghettoizes” the remembrance of Jewish suffering, is located outside the inner space of Sajmište, at the west margin of the memorial complex, between the tramline and the Mihajlo Popović Boulevard. The very center of the complex was allocated mostly for different contents. The majority of existing structures were intended for “art events, exhibitions, permanent exhibitions, etc.”, while the new buildings which will emerge from the mass of the Yugoslav pavilions and the Romanian Pavilion would have “the purpose of a sample fair”. As for the pre-war pavilions, only the Spasić Pavilion was allocated (along with the structures that were to be built in the coastal part) for the museum and its exhibition. The Detailed Urban Plan does not specify the content of this museum. However, bearing in mind the agreements which preceded its adopting, there is no doubt that the Spasic Pavilion was intended for the Museum of Genocide Victims.

While in the late 1980s and early 1990s there were ongoing debates in part of the public on whether Sajmište was a symbol of resistance to fascism and suffering in occupied Serbia or the site of the Serbian Yad Vashem, official documents increasingly emphasized the third dimension of this site’s history – its pre-war role of Belgrade Fair. This was a direct continuation of a trend which began during the planning of the Savski Plateau restoration, when the attitude was formed that Sajmište was too valuable, from the standpoint of urban development, but also as building land, to be just a

45 The entire project was led by architect Vesna Matičević, see Matičević, Vesna, “Detaljni urbanistički plan spomeničkog kompleksa Staro Sajmište” in Beogradska Staro sajmište 3+1, op. cit., pp. 351-355.
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“memorial complex” dedicated to the Nazi camp. More importantly, by introducing the idea of the pre-war Fair as an equally important part of this site’s history which deserves to be marked, the Detailed Urban Plan paved the way to the commercialization of Sajmište. Such an attitude towards Sajmište is today dominant in most initiatives for its development.

Of course, like in previous decades, authors of the Detailed Urban Plan were aware of the fact that there were no funds for the ambitious development project of Sajmište. At a time when the war in Croatia had already begun and Serbia was facing international sanctions, no one even thought about the relocation of inhabitants from Sajmište or the building of new structures. That is why (same as in 1987) the “first phase” of Sajmište’s restoration was to include the development of the coastal part, which was previously allocated for the large monument by sculptor Miodrag Popović. The grassy part along the bank, near the Old Fairground was supposed to assume “the role of adequately marking this historical site”, in anticipation of next phases of restoration, which were never commenced.49

49 “Detaljni urbanistički plan spomeničkog kompleksa ‘Staro sajmište’”, op. cit., p. 82.
Jovan Byford

The Old Fairground Today and in the Future

Since the 1960s, when the first initiative was launched to appropriately mark the Sajmište camp site, its memorialization was mostly dealt with by various associations of former inmates (who exerted influence most often through socio-political organizations such as SUBNOR (Associations of the People’s Liberation War Veterans of Yugoslavia) or SSRN (Socialist Alliance of the Working People), the Jewish community – which was mostly marginalized – and representatives of the Museum of Genocide Victims who strove to establish permanent premises at Sajmište during the 1990s. With the exception of a short period in the mid-1980s when Sajmište received more public attention as part of the campaign for “new revolutionary commitment”, city and republic institutions remembered this site only occasionally, mostly by supporting others’ initiatives or through megalomaniacal plans for the development of the Sava Bank Amphitheater, rarely observing the site’s historical significance. The 1966 decision on the “memorial riverbank”, Sajmište’s proclamation as cultural heritage in 1987 and the adoption of the Detailed Urban Plan in 1992 represent the only official decisions regarding Sajmište during the post-war period. However, judging by the site’s current state, they, too, were only empty rhetoric.

During the last five years, however, the experts, parts of the political elite and nongovernmental sector, as well as print and electronic media, began expressing greater interest in the fate of the Old Fairground. Since 2006, a series of public events was organized – exhibitions, round tables, multimedia projects, etc. – on the topic of the past, present and, more importantly, future of Sajmište. The same period saw several public initiatives for the development of the site, stemming from public or private institutions, resulting with increased media reports on this topic as opposed to the previous period. By analyzing the obvious increase of interest in Sajmište and the circumstances which led to it, we will attempt to gain insight in what Sajmište symbolizes today, the attitude of the Serbian society and state towards this site of suffering and the prospects of Sajmište becoming a site worthy of those who perished there between 1941 and 1944.

Most Recent Initiatives for the Development of the Old Fairground

The exhibition “Old Belgrade Fairground 3+1” held in April 2006 at the National Museum in Belgrade was the first important event that somewhat indicated the increased interest in Sajmište of recent years. It mostly consisted of photographs showing different periods of the Old Fairground’s history, while the main exhibit shown in the Museum’s atrium was a large-scale, 9 square meter model of the pre-war Belgrade Fair, built according to 1937 blueprints.1 The two-week event, described in a part of its promotional material as “Days of the Old Fairground”, included a series of round-table discussions dedicated to different issues concerning the history of the site. Topics included the “urbanistic-architectural significance” of the pre-war Fair, the suffering at the camp – “a place of suffering beneath windows of Belgrade”, as well as the arrival of artists who transformed it into a place of “refuge and renewal” during the 1950s. The exhibition was dominated by emphasis on the “three-layered nature of life” at the Old Fairground, i.e. its status of fair (pre-war period), place of suffering (concentration camp) and refuge (post-war art colony): the “3+1” in the event’s title referred to three different purposes of Sajmište during the last 70 years and the fourth, the “future”, which was also dealt with extensively. In fact, the exhibition was conceived as an attempt to push the issue of Sajmište’s future development into the public focus by grasping its layered past, as well as to pressure the authorities to fulfill their commitments to this cultural heritage and protect it from “self-serving urban development” which is a threat to the city’s historically significant locations. Hence, the exhibition’s organizers aimed to “attract attention of the authorities who previously did no more than shrug their shoulders when faced with the complicated nature of legal and ownership relations at Sajmište, thus condemning it to further material decay and its history to oblivion”.2 As explained by former inmate Desimir Tošić during the exhibition: “We must keep on fighting, criticizing, attacking, demanding”.3

The “Old Belgrade Fairground 3+1” exhibition was presented as a “civic initiative by four nongovernmental organizations”, i.e. Our Serbia – Serbia Nostra association (which advocates the restoration of architectural heritage and protection of natural heritage in Serbia and Kosovo), Sajmište Memorial Association, Serbian-Jewish Friendship Society (whose influence is hardly as strong as in the late 1980s and early 1990s, but apparently it still exists) and the Roma Holocaust Foundation (a nongovernmental organization founded in 2005 by Rajko Đurić). However, the exhibition would have never seen the light of day without the support from state and public institutions, mainly by the Ministry of Culture of the Republic of Serbia and the National Museum (main patrons) but also other institutions, expert bodies and city government branches which helped the realization of this project in one way or another.4

The main inspirator of the National Museum event was Darko Tatić, longstanding professor at the Faculty of Drama Arts in Belgrade and Radio Belgrade editor who is also the son of Rajko Tatić, one of the three architects who designed the Belgrade Fairground in 1937. The exhibition at the National Museum marked the latest phase of a long campaign for the revitalization of Sajmište which Tatić set in motion as early as in the mid-1990s. After the 1995 proposal to build “Europolis” at the Sava Bank Amphitheater, Darko Tatić protested against this idea. As he later explained in an interview, “the announcement about ‘Europolis’ instigated his ‘concern that someone would envisage the building of something completely different at the complex following a trend of attractive commercialization’”.5 He then issued a proclamation criticizing the plan of building a “new Manhattan” and the fact that, by placing the remains of Sajmište in an “unnatural location”, the project would deface Belgrade and help destroy its identity. More than one hundred public figures signed Tatić’s petition, including several distinguished architects, SANU members and university professors. This

1 The National Museum exhibition was curated by art historian Mare Janakova Grujić.
2 Ljubić, Nada, “Prijava za Konkurs za dodelu Priznanja iz oblasti odnosa sa javnošću”, in Beogradsko Staro sajmište 3+1, op. cit., p. 341.
3 In an interview for the Radio Belgrade 2 “Agora” program, quoted from Beogradsko Staro sajmište 3+1, op. cit., p. 314.
4 City of Belgrade Secretariat for Culture sponsored the maquette of Sajmište, the Institute of Urbanism Belgrade helped print the book containing statements from the round-table discussions and the City of Belgrade Institute for the Protection of Cultural Monuments supported the entire project by participating.
5 Interview with Darko Tatić, broadcast by Radio Belgrade 2, April 5 2006. Quoted from Beogradsko Staro sajmište 3+1, op. cit., p. 308.
campaign launched the idea of establishing the Serbia Nostra organization, with Darko Tatić as one of its most prominent members. After the “Europolis” idea was abandoned, Tatić continually campaigned for the development of Sajmište through Serbia Nostra activities, media appearances and texts published in professional literature.

The National Museum exhibition was well-attended, drawing significant attention of the Serbian media and inspiring several other events dedicated to the Old Fairground organized by the Institute of Urbanism Belgrade in the following years. In September 2007, on the 70th anniversary of the inauguration of the 1st Belgrade Fall Fair, the Institute hosted a smaller exhibition on Sajmište and published a special issue of its newsletter on this issue. Six months later, in March 2008, as part of the regular Salon of Architecture in Belgrade, the Institute of Urbanism organized another project – this time a multimedia event entitled “Old Belgrade Fairground as the Old New Belgrade Core”. It was one of several events organized by the Institute that year to mark the 60th anniversary of its existence. On that occasion, too, the organizers dealt in different ways with the past, present and future of Sajmište through workshops attended mainly by Belgrade University students.

The same period saw the launch of a series of concrete initiatives for the development of the Old Fairground. During the summer of 2007, President of the New Belgrade Municipality Željko Ožegović attempted, through representatives of the city authorities, to raise the question of Sajmište and initiate a project to revitalize at least some of the former camp’s buildings. In September, the New Belgrade Municipality applied – although, without success – for the National Investment Plan of the Republic of Serbia with the project “Reconstruction and Revitalization of the Old Fairground Memorial Complex”. The project envisaged the adaptation and recovery of the Turkish Pavilion for the requirements of a memorial center which would also plan a gradual reconstruction of the entire former camp complex. The efforts to establish such a memorial and educational center in Belgrade were at least to some extent, a reaction by a part of the social and political elite to the revisionist tendencies that were very relevant at the time in Serbian society (mainly the attempts to rehabilitate Milan Nedči and Dimitrije Ljotić), as well as to the near-total neglect of the Holocaust in educational programs.9 However, despite a preliminary agreement in January 2008 to open a museum at Sajmište in the foreseeable future, the project initiated by Ožegović failed to receive necessary support from relevant city and republic authorities. After the May 2008 local elections, the New Belgrade Municipality appointed a new president, which sealed the fate of this idea.

Around the same time, the B92 media company launched its own campaign to establish the Sajmište Memorial Center. It was conceived as expansion of the media project “Independent for the Truth”, which during the last ten years included the production of several noted documentaries and series on war crimes, causes of the Yugoslav wars and dealing with the past. The head of the RTV B92 Board of Managers Veran Matić explained in a 2009 interview that it became necessary to expand the “Independent for the Truth” project beyond film production and encompass the creation of a museum institution that will “deal with issues of remembrance and future, democracy and tolerance in a modern way; which will represent a multimedia center – an amalgamation of Holocaust museums worldwide, a museum of tolerance, museum of sites of suffering, etc.”. As a former camp and thus a “symbolic place”, Sajmište was recognized as the ideal location for such an institution. The initiators had great ambitions from the very outset. The Memorial Center would aim to rectify consequences of years of Sajmište’s political instrumentalization and marginalization, while publically presenting “causes of the recent wars” and promoting the values of tolerance and human and minority rights. Therefore, the center was conceived as a “cultural and educational” institution and a place where citizens can be informed about Sajmište but also “learn something about preventing the horrors of war and torture from ever repeating”.

The B92 project was backed by the New Belgrade Municipality, as well as the Federation of Jewish Communities in Serbia, whose representatives themselves at the time increasingly appealed to competent organs to finally transform Sajmište into a memorial center. However, the Jewish community was from the beginning strongly reserved about the plan of opening a Museum of Tolerance at Sajmište. They deemed it necessary to create an institution dedicated to the camp and to the Holocaust as an important aspect of its history before considering the possibility and manner of adding broader (and politically much more sensitive) issues of dealing with the past and events from the 1990s to the Memorial Center. Due to such reservations, the B92 project was mainly redirected towards marking Sajmište as a place of suffering and the Holocaust, although there were still background indications of an aspiration to include the future memorial with the issues of human rights, tolerance and dealing with the past.

The initiative by B92 quickly faced an insurmountable obstacle which had been in the way of realizing similar ideas in the past – unresolved property relations and disputes about the jurisdiction over buildings at the Old Fairground. Therefore, the project was quickly put on ice. Following estimates that the public – including those who decide on the future of Sajmište – lacks consciousness about the events from 1941 to 1944, it was decided to produce a documentary first in order to point out the significance of Sajmište as a place of suffering. The two-part documentary entitled “Sajmište – History of a Camp” was first aired on TV B92 on January 24th and 25th 2009.

A year later, in March 2010, it briefly seemed as though the memorial center initiated by B92 would see the light of day, after all. Namely, a trademark of this institution was formally presented in Belgrade. The logo in the shape of a stylized burning tear in red, white and blue was created by two world-renowned designers, Milton Glaser and Mirko Ilić. However, it quickly turned out that the realization of the Sajmište Memorial Center idea was still far-fetched and that, besides the documentary, a few public debates and media reports, there had been, in fact, no steps forward in this project since 2007. The reasons behind the creation and formal presentation of a logo

---

6 Ibid, p. 306. Serbia Nostra is active within the Europa Nostra federation, a network of national and regional organizations dealing with the protection of cultural and natural heritage.


8 “Staro beogradsko sajmište: 70 godina od otvaranja Prvog beogradskog međunarodnog sajma uzoraka”, Info - Urbanistički zavod Beograd, specijalno izdanje, September 2007. The exhibition was organized in cooperation with the Town Planners Association Belgrade, marking the “European Heritage Day”.

9 On details of the project, see Multimedijalni projekat: Staro Sajmište kao staro jезgro Novog Beograda, Belgrade, Urbanistički zavod, 2009.


14 The documentary, which contains striking testimonies of former Sajmište inmates, can be seen at following address: http://www.b92.net/special/sajmiste/video.php.

15 The 2008 Design Week in Belgrade hosted a panel on memorial architecture with participation of the world-
for a memorial center whose fate was uncertain, to say the least, remain unknown. Still, Mirko Ilić attempted to present his work as an essential part of the entire commemorative and educational project with a highly unconvincing claim that “the power of graphic design to convey a message to younger generations is exceptional” and that the modern logo (which was maliciously compared on various internet forums to a relay, a fire department logo, etc.) represents a part of the Memorial Center's future educational purpose. In other words, the logo was conceived as the first important step in transforming Sajmište into a new “brand”, a symbol of tolerance, multi-ethnicity and human rights. This fact alone is not necessarily controversial – after all, both Yad Vashem and the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum have recognizable logos and their own respective “brands” – but the problem lies in the fact that, when it comes to the Belgrade Museum of Tolerance, the logo marked both its beginning and endin That way, the whole initiative boiled down to good intentions and a professionally designed logo, creating the impression that this was a case of form and design receiving priority over essence and substance.

The last few years also saw different plans for Sajmište which indicated the continuing presence of the spirit of the 1990s in Serbia. A new permanent exhibition was opened in 2006 at the Memorial Museum in Jasenovac, considered by many, both in Serbia and Croatia, a redrawing of history and insult to the victims' remembrance. Consequently, the idea to open the Museum of Genocide victims at the Old Fairground was reinitiated. This museum was widely perceived as the proper way to mark the suffering of Serbs, Jews and Roma in the NDH and thus respond to the “inappropriate exhibition” at Jasenovac. Supporters of this solution included Milan Bušić, a new “fellow combatants” such as Srboljub Živanović, who is today probably the most persistent advocate of the argument about 700.00 victims of Jasenovac. Živanović also lobbied then Prime Minister Vojislav Koštunica's support for the Sajmište museum. Smilja Tišma of the Association of Former Jasenovac Inmates recognized the Sajmište museum as a place where “people from all around the world” would be informed about the suffering in the NDH, i.e. the facts concealed by the new Jasenovac exhibition. A resolution adopted by the Association in 2006 justifies the demand for the museum's establishment at Sajmište by claiming that this location “fulfills all conditions” since it was the site of an Ustasha camp, part of the “Jasenovac system”. More importantly, the Old Fairground memorial museum was a topic during the five-day Israeli-Serbian scientific exchange dedicated to Holocaust research, organized by the Ministry of Culture of the Republic of Serbia in the summer of 2006. The necessity of the museum's creation and its future disposition was again discussed in the context of the controversy regarding the new exhibition at Jasenovac.

All this points out that the public, as well as a part of the political elite, still perceives Sajmište as a memorial “branch” of Jasenovac and a significant arena of the “war of remembrance” between Belgrade and Zagreb.

Besides those initiatives, another factor which certainly contributed to increased interest in Sajmište of recent years is the controversy caused by “inappropriate contents” at the “Posejdon” club in the Spasić Pavilion. When in March 2006 the organizers of the “Old Belgrade Fairground 3+1” exhibition made public that a concert by pop performer Boy George would be held at the building which formerly housed the camp hospital, a part of the public protested and the New Belgrade Municipality demanded from the City of Belgrade Secretariat for Culture to officially ban such events from taking place at Sajmište. However, this reaction cannot be compared to the avalanche of disapproval directed at the British group “Kosheen” that was scheduled to perform at the same location in November 2007. The British band would have probably enjoyed the same treatment as Boy George (the concert would have still taken place in spite of objections by a part of the public) if the news had not leaked outside Serbia and been published, mainly by American and Israeli newspapers. Protests of international institutions followed, the loudest coming from Efrain Zuroff, Director of the Israeli Simon Wiesenthal Center who urged the Government of the Republic of Serbia and President Tadić to take measures in order to put to a halt such desecration of an important Holocaust site. As is usually the case in Serbia, outside pressure brought about a swift reaction by the authorities: the concert was cancelled, followed by numerous promises from highest authorities that the Sajmište issue would be finally resolved.

Since then, Serbian government officials often asserted that the creation of a “national memorial center” at Sajmište was a matter of “serious considerations” of highest state organs and that the project involves “various, relevant institutions from the country and abroad”. However, four years after the state organs announced their effort to open a memorial center at Sajmište, the status of this project still remains completely unknown. As recently explained by historian Dejan Ristić, Advisor at the Ministry of Labor and Social Policy, the establishment of a memorial center requires “a sound conception” and therefore the project will be presented to the Government of Serbia and the broader public only after it is “conceived” well enough. However, it is indicative that to this day, the “relevant institutions” from the country and abroad involved in the creation of the memorial center have not been made public nor has it been stated how much progress was made in its “conceiving”. It even remains unknown what exactly this “national” center will be dedicated to. All in all, the fact that this state initiative remains veiled in secrecy, as well as that, according to admissions by competent institutions, there was never a deadline for the project’s realization, prompt the conclusion that this entire time nothing has been actually done other than “debates at Ministry of Labor and Social Policy meetings”, mentioned by Ristić.

We should also mention the news which became relevant in the fall of 2011, directly pertaining to the reconstruction of Sajmište and its purpose as a future “national” memorial center. Namely, during a debate on the Draft Law on Restitution and changes and amendments to the Law on...
Restitution of Property to Churches and Religious Communities, the Federation of Jewish Communities in Serbia addressed a demand to state organs to implement the Law to property seized since 1941, rather than only since 1945. This way, property confiscated by German and collaborationist authorities during the occupation would be returned to the Jewish community and the Law would be harmonized with the 2009 Terezín Declaration which obligates European countries to return Jewish property seized by the Nazis. The Federation of Jewish Communities proposed the use of property which belonged to Jewish Holocaust victims for the establishment of a fund with the purpose of maintaining the Jewish community in Serbia. However, in the summer of 2011, during talks between the President of the Federation of Jewish Communities in Serbia and Serbian Government Deputy Prime Minister Božidar Delić, the Jewish community was told that Serbia had no funds to return the property of Holocaust victims but was willing to offer an alternative solution. Instead of restitution, the Government would establish a special fund to finance the building of a memorial center dedicated to Holocaust victims at the Old Fairground.²⁴

The state’s gain by such solution is manifold and obvious. The funds for the Holocaust museum at Sajmište represent a small part of seized Jewish property, estimated at 550 million Euros. Besides, Sajmište is supposed be reconstructed as it is, so if this project can be financed through funds which should be subject of restitution to the Jewish community – even better, for it represents additional financial burden of Holocaust memorialization.

However, it is frustrating that everyone involved – including the Deputy Prime Minister, representatives of competent ministries and President of the Republic, who supported this proposal – failed to comprehend the message sent by the proposed solution. Firstly, it clearly defines the restitution of Holocaust victims’ property as a matter of second-rate importance as opposed to property confiscated by communist authorities. No member of the government even considered the establishment of a fund to finance the creation of a memorial center for the remembrance of victims of communism rather than restitution of property seized after 1945 due to a “lack of funds”. Secondly, it is obvious that the state deems it its right to freely manage the property seized from Jews in 1941 and decide on its own initiative how much it will keep for itself and how much will be used for the museum. Thirdly, this solution implies that the financial burden of Holocaust memorialization, even indirectly, is to be carried by the Jewish community. This is nothing new, of course. All initiatives for the development of Sajmište since the late 1980s involved “financial involvement” by Jews from Serbia, as well as from America and Israel. The latest case is therefore another symptom of a “disease” widely spread in Serbia which, to an extent, represents the basis of the decades-long marginalization of the Holocaust. The Holocaust is not viewed as an inseparable part of Serbian history and national remembrance and a crime whose victims call for the commitment of the entire society, but rather as part of the history of the Jewish community which bears the largest financial and moral responsibility for its memorialization.

Another controversial issue regarding the latest “offer” to the Jewish community is the fact that it is unclear to which extent the Serbian government actually has jurisdiction over Sajmište. Namely, it is certain that today, as in previous decades, there is a dispute between different levels of authority in Serbia and Belgrade over the actual ownership of the Old Fairground. As the republic government prepares the “national memorial center” or Holocaust museum project (which implies that Sajmište, as a site of national significance, falls under its jurisdiction), the Belgrade authorities led by Mayor Dragan Dilas apparently have their own plans for the site. In August 2011, media reported that the Mayor had “formed his own task force with the aim to study all aspects and values of the site, learn about all previous initiatives and coordinate the institutions’ work.”²³ It is unknown whether this “coordination” would involve cooperation with the republic government but there is no doubt that, while awaiting further decisions on the future of Sajmište, there will be harsh debates behind closed doors between the republic, city and the New Belgrade Municipality on who has the right to decide about Sajmište’s future appearance and purpose, but also who should finance its reconstruction.

However, let us briefly revisit the “inappropriate contents” at the Spasić Pavilion and public reactions that urged state organs to at least promise a permanent solution for Sajmište. The “scandalous” performances by Boy George and “Kosheen” were neither the first nor last entertainment events at the Old Fairground. For almost a decade, the large hall and smaller conference halls at the former Spasić Pavilion were rented for various cultural, entertainment, business and sporting events. The “Poseidon” club is the scene of regular performances by world-renowned DJs, New Year’s Eve celebrations, art exhibitions, dance competitions, theater plays and other similar events.²⁵ Furthermore, only a month after the cancellation of the “Kosheen” concert, “Poseidon” hosted an international boxing match which hardly caused any public reaction, without even serious considerations for its ban in The meantime, the state failed to respond when a restaurant was opened at the former Turkish Pavilion, a building which was used as a morgue during the war. Therefore, one should not overemphasize the alleged public concern for Sajmište or the occasional (and short-lived) disgust at the sacrilege of a site which has been derelict for decades.

The attention of state and local authorities towards Sajmište is solely for the purpose of satisfying short-term needs: calming the public opinion, scoring a few political points or, most often, fulfilling the minimum expectations of international organizations. The situation is similar when it comes to private initiatives. For example, the media company B92 reported extensively about criticisms of parties and concerts at the Spasić Pavilion in late 2007, when the idea about the Museum of Tolerance was being promoted and needed public support. However, before and after that, B92 covered equally inappropriate events at Sajmište without any criticism or references to the competent organs’ responsibility.²⁶

But still, when taking into account the whole series of initiatives for the reconstruction of Sajmište during the last five years, as well as numerous public events and debates on this issue, there is an unavoidable impression that the necessity of Sajmište’s development is today discussed more than ever. In addition to that, this discussion involves a much higher number of participants than in the past – including republic, city and municipal authorities, the nongovernmental sector, Federation of Jewish Communities, media, professional institutions such as the Institute of Ur-

²⁴ For the content of this discussion, see “Gospodine Đeliću, Jevreji će u vašem nacrtu prepoznati nacističke zakone”, Jevrejski pregled, October 2011, pp. 10-13.
²⁵ Director of the Institute for the Protection of Cultural Monuments Belgrade Milica Grondanin in “Neobežetena tragedija”, RTS web site, August 26 2011, (to access click HERE)
²⁶ See “Nema poštovanja za žrtve”, Blic, October 27 2007, (to access click HERE)
²⁷ For example, “Cirkus istorija Sonje Vukičević na BITF-u”, B92.net, September 21 2006, (to access click HERE)
“Izložba Marka Somborea”, B92.net, July 4 2008, (to access click HERE)
banism or Institute for the Protection of Cultural Monuments, etc. However, the interesting part of most recent proposals which also gives rise to concern is a substantial change in today's interpretation of the Old Fairground's historical significance. Namely, as opposed to initiatives of the past decades, there is a noticeable shift in emphasis from Sajmište as a site of suffering to its history before and after World War II. There have also been debates about what Sajmište symbolizes – Yugoslav unity, values of NOB, resistance against the foreign conqueror, the Holocaust, Serbian suffering in the NDH and so forth – but the focus of remembrance was still on the period of Nazi occupation. This is no longer the case.

Most recently, the pre-war Belgrade Fairground and the 1950s art colony, rather than just the camp, are increasingly being considered objects of remembrance. This significant change, its causes and consequences on the future development of Sajmište call for a more thorough analysis and critical review.

The Old Fairground: “Meeting Place” and “Cultural Center” or Memorial Site?

Participants of the event “Old Belgrade Fairground 3+1” in April 2006 – which presented Sajmište as a “unique site of multilayered memories” – often emphasized its tragic war fate. Nada Kurtović-Folić of Serbia Nostra spoke of the Old Fairground as “holy ground”, condemning its incomprehensible devastation during previous decades. Darko Tatić considers Sajmište a “place of torture of patriots and nations doomed by Hitler to perish” which requires a worthy “memorial center”. Architect Svetislav Vučenović, one of participants at the panel on the architectural and urban planning aspect of Sajmište even urged the adoption of a special “law on the Sajmište Memorial” which would enable the removal of “inappropriate content” – inappropriate mainly because it was a place of death and sufferin\textsuperscript{29}

The Old Fairground’s war history was repeatedly stressed as source of a moral imperative to appropriately organize this site, at long last. However, whenever it was debated on how Sajmište should be restored and to what purpose, the camp was put aside. Some of the participants even criticized (although implicitly) those who view Sajmište exclusively as site of the former camp.

The “multilayered nature” of Sajmište, as explained by Svetislav Vučenović, represents its essence: “the other component”, i.e. the pre-war fair and the post-war art colony can by no means be omitted from the history of Sajmište. The “trinity” of content and purpose represents the “meaning of the Old Fairground phenomenon: life - destruction - rebirth” and makes up the backbone of the future, organized Sajmište.

Although this interpretation gives equal significance to all three periods in the history of the Old Fairground, visitors of the National Museum exhibition could not look past the fact that the period between 1937 and 1941 was prioritized. Participants of the forums and round-table discussions emphasized the importance of Sajmište mainly as a “forgotten architectural value”, a “textbook example of our civil engineering heritage”, “highlight of the 1930s Serbian modernism’s urban development”, “expression of civic Belgrade’s rise” and the “symbol of its glow”. Sajmište was described as “display of a people’s creative capability” and “expression of our relatively young economy’s vitality, its potentials”. The exhibition’s catalogue only included photographs of the pre-war fair, not a single one of the camp. After all, the central exhibit, shown in the museum’s atrium, was a model of Sajmište – however, not from the concentration camp period, when the complex was surrounded by guards, watchtowers and barbed wire, when fountains were built and earth-closets dug out between the pavilions. The Sajmište presented to the visitors was shiny, white and solemn, as conceived by its young authors in 1937.

The apothecosis of Sajmište’s pre-war history set the parameters for the discussion about its future. The organizers’ proposal – apparently agreed on by most of the participants – was to reconstruct Sajmište according to the preserved pre-war plans, thus restoring its “original and authentic form”. The Vice President of the Serbia Nostra Association, Irina Subotić, urged the society to return to the “authentic, superior values of the Old Fairground” and, by reconstructing the demolished pavilions, revert to Belgrade a “valuable segment of its identity” and its “former radiance”\textsuperscript{30}. Architect Šlobodan Mašić considers the opening of the 1937 Fall Fair the moment when Serbia “had the feeling of joining civilization, joining Europe, in the best possible way”. Although Mašić reminds of the “fate of unfortunate people imprisoned behind wires, tortured and murdered”, he does not recognize the camp as an aspect of Sajmište that should be visibly marked in its future appearance in any way. Moreover, according to Mašić, Sajmište “has only one grand and noble feature: a day we must remember, which is the day of its opening”\textsuperscript{31}. The idea of restoring Sajmište’s pre-war appearance also implies at least “partial” revival of its former purpose. The participants of the gathering at the National Museum advocated returning Sajmište to its “initial economic purpose of commerce” and providing space for “economic activity, trade, foreign subsidiaries”, for an “exclusive exhibition space” and “commercial contents”. Despite repeatedly stressing that the content of the “exhibition space” would always be adjusted to the “memorial purpose” of the Old Fairground and that “inappropriate contents” would be excluded, no one even tried to explain what that actually means. In other words: what can be exhibited, sold or bought at the site of a concentration camp? It was also stated that one of the pavilions would certainly be transformed into a museum dedicated to the victims, thus paying due respect. But, as a whole, the renewed Sajmište was conceived as something much bigger than a memorial center: it should become a “cultural meeting place of the elite – European and ours”, as it was before World War II\textsuperscript{32}.

30 Quoted from the exposé of Branko Bojović, Miroslav Tasić, Antonije Antić and Žaklina Gligorijević, quoted from Beogradsko Staro sajmište, 3+1, op. cit., p. 122. 28 Architect Svetislav Vučenović, one of participants at the panel on the architectural and urban planning aspect of Sajmište even urged the adoption of a special “law on the Sajmište Memorial” which would enable the removal of “inappropriate content” – inappropriate mainly because it was a place of death and sufferin\textsuperscript{29}.

29 Tatić, Darko, interview to Radio Belgrade 2, April 5 2006, quoted from Beogradsko Staro sajmište, 3+1, op. cit., p. 305. 29 Vučenović, Svetislav, “Inicijativni program revitalizacije Starog sajmišta”, Beogradsko Staro sajmište, 3+1, op. cit., p. 63. 30 Quoted from the exposé of Nada Kurtović-Folić, Mira Janakova-Grujić and Branko Bojović, quoted from Beogradsko Staro sajmište, 3+1, op. cit., p. 11, 49 and 89. 32 Subotić, Irina, address during the opening of the exhibition “Old Belgrade Fairground 3+1”, quoted from Beogradsko Staro sajmište, 3+1, op. cit., p. 27. 31 Mašić, Slobodan, “Na dan njegovog otvaranja”, Beogradsko Staro sajmište, 3+1, op. cit., p. 122. 32 Subotić, Irina, address during the opening of the exhibition “Old Belgrade Fairground 3+1”, quoted from Beogradsko Staro sajmište, 3+1, op. cit., p. 112, 236, 348, and 81. 33 While articulating “reasons for restoration” of the Old Fairground, Darko Tatić explicitly states: “we do not advocate the restoration of the Fair as a camp, but we believe that one of the pavilions should by all means be transformed into a museum”, in Tatić, Darko, “Restauracija urbanističkog kompleksa Staro sajmište u Beogradu”, op. cit., p. 86. 34 Vukotić-Lazar, Marta, the “Trezor” program on the Old Fairground, RTS, May 9 2006, quoted from Beogradsko Staro sajmište, 3+1, op. cit., p. 135.
Besides the renewal of the purpose as sample fair and the opening of a memorial museum (crammed into one pavilion, in order not to disturb the positive message of the reconstructed Sajmište), a space was allocated for contents of culture and arts, too, as homage to the post-war art colony. Even though the artists’ arrival at Sajmište in the early 1950s was a product of a highly disputable policy of World War II remembrance which involved total neglect of concentration camps as historically significant places, art is today considered by some circles the “cornerstone” of all future activities at the renewed Old Fairground. According to one interpretation, this is primarily because art fulfills the memorial purpose of Sajmište. A temple of arts would glorify “life in freedom, for which many citizens of our community fought and sacrificed” and represent an “homage to generations who sacrificed so that future ones could gain creative freedom.” The alternative interpretation is that culture represents “the only key for reconciliation of historic facts of fairground and place of suffering”. A cultural center would ennoble Sajmište and symbolically unite all three phases of its history: “the dignity of the memorial complex” would be preserved and at the same time Sajmište would become a “lively meeting place” like the Belgrade Fair used to be. This surely cannot be accomplished by a memorial complex dedicated to victims of the camp.

The “Old Belgrade Fairground 3+1” exhibition is not the only event in recent years with a noticeable tendency towards the marginalization of Sajmište’s memorial aspect, for the sake of its purpose as a “sample fair” or a space for “commercial contents”. For instance, at the time when Željko Ožegović advocated the establishment of a memorial center at Sajmište, the New Belgrade Municipality’s Strategic Development Plan (Ožegović was head of the municipality at the time) did not specify the Old Fairground as a site of historic significance, but as one of (commercially) “exclusive locations” on the territory of the municipality which in the future needs to be “used for the requirements of potential investors”. The B92 initiative for the Museum of Tolerance, which at first glance seemed fully dedicated to mark the camp, still failed to designate the entire Sajmište complex with a purpose as remembrance site. The renewed Old Fairground site was instead conceived as a “meeting place mainly for many young people” where, besides learning about the suffering at the camp and “tolerance, human rights and nonviolence” they, together with their families, will be able to “acquire their regular portion of culture, knowledge, innovation”. This also has to do with the alleged “multilayered” history of Sajmište: it would provide “a space for history of architecture and civil engineering” (homage to the pre-war fair) as well as a “media museum” (marking the first television program broadcasting at the Philips Pavilion in 1938), an exhibition space, art galleries, etc. Hence, this is also a concept of Sajmište as “meeting place”, albeit without explicit commercial content. Even though the B92 project did not envisage a full reconstruction of Sajmište according to 1937 blueprints, it maintained the possibility of additional buildin “The space is rather large”, Veran Matić explained in a 2009 interview, “and it is possible to build a monumental structure which could become one of the city’s symbols”.

Similar ideas about the future appearance and purpose of Sajmište were introduced as part of the multimedia project “Old Belgrade Fairground as the Old New Belgrade Core”, organized in spring 2008 by the Institute of Urbanism Belgrade. The first exhibition (or “workshop”) within this project presented solutions for the development of the Old Fairground, designed for this occasion by Belgrade University final year architecture students. The subject was assigned by their mentors, architects Mustafa Musić and Ela Nešić, and it was not “Memorial Center – Old Fairground” or something similar which would clearly mark this site as place of remembrance of suffering at the camp, but “Info Park/Center – Transfer of Ideas”. This is how Nešić and Musić justified their choice:

“This location contains several historic layers which certainly should be somehow implemented in its future concept (pre-war period – Fairground, war period – concentration camp, post-war period – art colonies). Still, while outlining the theme of the study we favored the idea of progress related to the pre-war period of Sajmište, as well as of the first urban space in New Belgrade, considering that the concept of idea transfer was very much present during the Belgrade Fair period, which is the most appropriate for this moment...”

Moreover, the description of this subject specifies that “there is not a single reason why this space should not acquire features of an exceptional info-center in the near or distant future”. The structures at Sajmište, both from the pre-war period and ones that are to be built, could be “transformed into museums, various kinds of workshops, such as the museum of architecture, film museum, music museum and, finally, a museum to preserve and analyze significant art phenomena in our environment.”

Sajmište’s characterization as symbol of “significant art phenomena” is surely another insinuation of the role attributed to the 1950s art colony in the development of arts – this was the subject of as many as two (out of four) workshops of this multimedia project. However, it is indicative that not one workshop, exhibition or installation was dedicated to the camp and its victims. The round table on the subject of Sajmište’s future – with participation of mainly architects and urban planners – recognized the necessity of including the “memorial complex” in the plans of the site’s development, but it was also pointed out that the “process of revitalization” must not render this site “uninteresting and unvisited”. A “mixture of contents” was proposed following assumptions that Sajmište as exclusively a site of remembrance would be “uninteresting” to the broader public.

Although there are many differences between the initiatives and proposals of recent years – in that sense, there is no consensus on the future appearance and purpose of Sajmište – it is clear that agreement is being slowly reached in regard to several key issues. Firstly, the three phases of Sajmište’s history are routinely recognized as equally important. The “sacrifice” of thousands of people who perished at the camp and the “creative work” – pre-war (architecture) or post-war (art colonies) – are both putable policy of World War II remembrance which involved total neglect of concentration camps as historically significant places, art is today considered by some circles the “cornerstone” of all future activities at the renewed Old Fairground. According to one interpretation, this is primarily because art fulfills the memorial purpose of Sajmište. A temple of arts would glorify “life in freedom, for which many citizens of our community fought and sacrificed” and represent an “homage to generations who sacrificed so that future ones could gain creative freedom.” The alternative interpretation is that culture represents “the only key for reconciliation of historic facts of fairground and place of suffering”. A cultural center would ennoble Sajmište and symbolically unite all three phases of its history: “the dignity of the memorial complex” would be preserved and at the same time Sajmište would become a “lively meeting place” like the Belgrade Fair used to be. This surely cannot be accomplished by a memorial complex dedicated to victims of the camp.

The “Old Belgrade Fairground 3+1” exhibition is not the only event in recent years with a noticeable tendency towards the marginalization of Sajmište’s memorial aspect, for the sake of its purpose as a “sample fair” or a space for “commercial contents”. For instance, at the time when Željko Ožegović advocated the establishment of a memorial center at Sajmište, the New Belgrade Municipality’s Strategic Development Plan (Ožegović was head of the municipality at the time) did not specify the Old Fairground as a site of historic significance, but as one of (commercially) “exclusive locations” on the territory of the municipality which in the future needs to be “used for the requirements of potential investors”. The B92 initiative for the Museum of Tolerance, which at first glance seemed fully dedicated to mark the camp, still failed to designate the entire Sajmište complex with a purpose as remembrance site. The renewed Old Fairground site was instead conceived as a “meeting place mainly for many young people” where, besides learning about the suffering at the camp and “tolerance, human rights and nonviolence” they, together with their families, will be able to “acquire their regular portion of culture, knowledge, innovation”. This also has to do with the alleged “multilayered” history of Sajmište: it would provide “a space for history of architecture and civil engineering” (homage to the pre-war fair) as well as a “media museum” (marking the first television program broadcasting at the Philips Pavilion in 1938), an exhibition space, art galleries, etc. Hence, this is also a concept of Sajmište as “meeting place”, albeit without explicit commercial content. Even though the B92 project did not envisage a full reconstruction of Sajmište according to 1937 blueprints, it maintained the possibility of additional buildin “The space is rather large”, Veran Matić explained in a 2009 interview, “and it is possible to build a monumental structure which could become one of the city’s symbols”.

Similar ideas about the future appearance and purpose of Sajmište were introduced as part of the multimedia project “Old Belgrade Fairground as the Old New Belgrade Core”, organized in spring 2008 by the Institute of Urbanism Belgrade. The first exhibition (or “workshop”) within this project presented solutions for the development of the Old Fairground, designed for this occasion by Belgrade University final year architecture students. The subject was assigned by their mentors, architects Mustafa Musić and Ela Nešić, and it was not “Memorial Center – Old Fairground” or something similar which would clearly mark this site as place of remembrance of suffering at the camp, but “Info Park/Center – Transfer of Ideas”. This is how Nešić and Musić justified their choice:

“This location contains several historic layers which certainly should be somehow implemented in its future concept (pre-war period – Fairground, war period – concentration camp, post-war period – art colonies). Still, while outlining the theme of the study we favored the idea of progress related to the pre-war period of Sajmište, as well as of the first urban space in New Belgrade, considering that the concept of idea transfer was very much present during the Belgrade Fair period, which is the most appropriate for this moment...”

Moreover, the description of this subject specifies that “there is not a single reason why this space should not acquire features of an exceptional info-center in the near or distant future”. The structures at Sajmište, both from the pre-war period and ones that are to be built, could be “transformed into museums, various kinds of workshops, such as the museum of architecture, film museum, music museum and, finally, a museum to preserve and analyze significant art phenomena in our environment.”

Sajmište’s characterization as symbol of “significant art phenomena” is surely another insinuation of the role attributed to the 1950s art colony in the development of arts – this was the subject of as many as two (out of four) workshops of this multimedia project. However, it is indicative that not one workshop, exhibition or installation was dedicated to the camp and its victims. The round table on the subject of Sajmište’s future – with participation of mainly architects and urban planners – recognized the necessity of including the “memorial complex” in the plans of the site’s development, but it was also pointed out that the “process of revitalization” must not render this site “uninteresting and unvisited”. A “mixture of contents” was proposed following assumptions that Sajmište as exclusively a site of remembrance would be “uninteresting” to the broader public.

Although there are many differences between the initiatives and proposals of recent years – in that sense, there is no consensus on the future appearance and purpose of Sajmište – it is clear that agreement is being slowly reached in regard to several key issues. Firstly, the three phases of Sajmište’s history are routinely recognized as equally important. The “sacrifice” of thousands of people who perished at the camp and the “creative work” – pre-war (architecture) or post-war (art colonies) – are both...
of Milan Nedić, meaning of the term “antifascism”, etc) is considered a source of unnecessary social divisions which disturb the consensus on basic national issues, divert attention and energy from solving current political and economical problems, thus slowing down progress of the society.

The main strategy to avoid these issues during the last ten or so years was the insisting on “facing the future” as the greatest value. Traces of such an approach to the past are clearly visible in the perception of Sajmište, as well. In May 2008, at the formal inauguration of the Park “Republika Srpska”, located at the left Sava riverbank, between the “Gazela” Bridge and the Old Railway Bridge (a few hundred meters upstream from the Old Fairground), President of Serbia Boris Tadić singled out Sajmište as a “place from which Serbia sends a message to the world that it wants reconciliation, that it pays respect to all past victims, but also wishes to move forward”. So, even from the site of a former concentration camp – which, significantly, was never appropriately marked and whose victims were never honored – it is advisable to send a message that Serbia is not a prisoner of the past, but is rather facing the future. The attitude of Tadić’s statement, made in the midst of an election campaign, makes up the essence of the majority of recent initiatives for the development of Sajmište. The past is important and will be marked at the museum in one of the Old Fairground buildings, as well as by annual commemorations which will take place there on the Day of Genocide Victims or International Holocaust Remembrance Day. But, at the same time, Sajmište will be a place from where Serbia and Belgrade will look “forward”. That is, after all, why Sajmište is considered the natural space for the youth, i.e. a center of culture, knowledge, arts, innovation, information society and whatnot, and the pre-war Sajmište is presented as an imaginary “golden age” when Belgrade stepped forward to Europe and began its systematic development as a modern metropolis. Accordingly, just as during previous decades the Sajmište camp was seen by many as a monument of Belgrade’s revolutionary past, new generations today selectively reinterpret this site’s past in accordance with their own respective ideological priorities, finding in the pre-war Sajmište a symbol of Belgrade as a “meeting place” facing towards the future, Europe and economic and technological progress.

Besides, ever since the 1970s and plans to build an opera at Sajmište, the main obstacle to any kind of development of the site is the expense of relocating families who were accommodated there as early as in the 1950s. A partial commercialization of Sajmište is a common topic today, widely recognized as the solution of this problem and potential source of the reconstruction’s fundin In 2006, architect Branko Bojović attempted to explain that, although the building of a memorial museum at Sajmište represents a “priority”, “we must build the concept of a cultural asset as an economic asset, as well”.52 Because, “if the Old Fairground is reduced to just memory and culture”, Bojović explains, “I wonder who will financially support it”.53 In other words, Serbia has no money for a memorial complex dedicated to Sajmište victims. Consequently, opening doors to commercial contents, to an “exclusive exhibition space” for foreign companies, etc (all under the excuse of bringing Sajmište back to its “original values”) is imposed as an alternative “economic basis of the entire complex’s reconstruction”.54 City of Belgrade Assembly Secretary for Culture Darjan Mihaljović had something similar in mind in 2006 when he proposed seeking

---

(art) – are viewed as equally worthy of distinguishin48 As explained in 2008 by the then Director of the Institute of Urbanism Belgrade Antonije Antić, “the future character of the location” should generate an “interlacement” of the three phases of Sajmište’s life: namely, the museum dedicated to the camp, the “exclusive exhibition space” and cultural contents should be “twined into a single compact composition”.49 At the same time, the constant emphasis on Sajmište as, above all, “meeting place”, “place for the youth” or “cultural center” gradually overshadows its importance as memorial site. While the camp is stressed today as the reason for the development of Sajmište, the majority of the public including representatives of expert bodies who will undoubtedly take part in the decision-making process, do not consider the memorial center the only, or the key aspect of its future.

However, there are several reasons – of ideological, but also practical nature – why the idea of Sajmište as a “multipurpose” space is increasingly brought up as the optimal solution. The past, especially pertaining to World War II, has no great political or social value. Preserving the remembrance of the 1941-1944 period and facing its heritage is no longer viewed as a matter of importance for shaping collective national identity or establishing a value system which, ultimately, determines the society’s direction of development. Instead, a significant part of the ruling political elite considers the relationship with the past principally a matter of individual attitude and interpretation, believing that the issue of World War II was compromised through manipu-

48 Tasić, Miroslav, “Staro Sajmište u svetu pravne zaštite kulturnog nasleđa”, Beogradsko Staro sajmište, 3+1, op. cit., p. 236.
50 See, for example, Vukotić-Lazar, Marta, “Jezik univerzalne komunikacije”, Beogradsko Staro sajmište, 3+1, op. cit., p. 69.
51 In the valid General Plan of Belgrade 2021, adopted in September 2003, Sajmište is mentioned as a “cultural asset” whose “transformation” includes “the building of new structures of a modern content and form” and “planning new commercial and public contents which, however, remain in the purpose of this site’s cultural and memorial character”. However, at the same time Sajmište is also mentioned as part of the city whose development could move in the direction of “catering, tourism and entertainment”; Škupština grada Beograda, Generálni plan Beograda 2021, p. 62, 107, 149.
52 Bojović, Branko, “Urbanizam estetike ili urbanizam nuđe”, Beogradsko Staro sajmište, 3+1, op. cit., p. 112.
53 Quoted from “Spomenik, ne leglo tajkuna”, Politika, April 12 2006, p. 27.
54 Bojović, Branko, “Između privrede i memorije”, Beogradsko Staro sajmište, 3+1, op. cit., p. 91.
“help” from the countries that built national pavilions at the Belgrade Fairground in the 1930s, for the revitalization of the fair complex.55

This increasingly closer connection between the preservation of remembrance of a site of suffering during Nazi occupation and the process of economic transition in Serbia is also illustrated by the example of Topovske Supe near Autokomanda in Belgrade. It is the location of a detention camp which in the fall of 1941 interned male Jewish population from the territories of Belgrade and Banat, from where the inmates were taken to be executed. In January 2006, the International Holocaust Remembrance Day (January 27th) was marked in Serbia for the first time with a ceremony of revealing a modest memorial plaque on a dilapidated wall in Tabanovacka Street, in the immediate vicinity of the building which used to house the camp administration.56 However, during the ceremony, the public was not notified that this was apparently only a temporary memorial site. Namely, one year prior, three hectares of land between Tabanovacka Street, Oslabodjenje Square and the highway – the largest part of the Topovske Supe area, including buildings which formerly housed the camp and the wall containing the memorial plaque – were sold to the Delta Company. It was already certain that all existing structures at the location were scheduled for demolition to provide space for the building of a monumental “Delta City” complex that would include a shopping mall, cinema and bowling alley. According to a source from the Ministry of Labor and Social Policy which is in charge of marking sites of suffering on the territory of the Republic of Serbia, this sale could not have been prevented since Topovske Supe was never officially proclaimed a location of historic significance. Yet, the fate of the plaque was consequently solved by the new landowner’s personal commitment to organize the memorial site and set up the memorial plaque at the site, of historic significance. Accordingly, the “compromise solution” in this case not only meant conceding the site of the former camp to a private company for a shopping mall, but also shifting jurisdiction over the concept and maintenance of a memorial site. Hope remains that this example of “cooperation” between the state and the private sector will not serve as inspiration for the decisions pertaining to the Old Fairground.

There are few voices in Serbia today questioning the ever-increasing insisting on the “trinity” of Old Fairground’s character and the emphasis on the pre-war Fair which gradually legitimizes its commercialization. To that end, it is worth reminding that Sajmište is not the only concentration camp with a pre-war history. Dachau, for instance, was located in buildings of a former ammunition factory, Risiwa di San Sabba in Trieste was a rice processing factory before the war, while a part of the Jasenovac camp (the so-called Ciglana or Jasenovac III) was located in industrial plants and facilities belonging to the wealthy local Bačić family before the war. Still, today it would be unthinkable for someone to advocate the equal representation of different “phases” or “components” of the past at the Dachau, Trieste or Jasenovac memorials, or to say that those locations should be brought back to their “original values” and restore their appearance and purpose from the period before World War II. On the contrary, it would be considered an impermissible redrawing of history, insult to victims and an attempt to erase the tragic past. Regardless of the events at sites of concentration camps prior to the arrival of Nazis or Ustaše, or after 1945, from the moment the first victims were brought there, there is only one historical period worthy of attention and remembrance.

The fact that there are obviously different standards for Sajmište is surely a consequence of everything that took place at this location in the last 65 years. Mostly due to its central, “exclusive” location, Sajmište was never viewed as a unique locality which deserves to be preserved as site of a concentration camp, in accordance with norms regulating the manner of conserving and marking of such places. This would call for Sajmište – due to its unique tragic past – to be distinguished as a memorial complex, both visually and functionally, from its urban surroundings and thus symbolically remind of the void the camp, as a Holocaust site, had left in the life of the Serbian capital. Ever since 1945, when the building of New Belgrade began, all plans regarding Sajmište’s development – regardless whether they envisaged building structures of “cultural significance”, planting greenery, erecting an opera or “Europolis” – were directed towards this location’s gradual inclusion into the broader urban matrix of the metropolis, the landscape of New Belgrade or the future Sava Bank Amphitheater. The perception of Sajmište mainly as an urban space and increasingly as “exclusive location” which is too significant in terms of material value and urban development to be only a memorial park or memorial complex, represents the essence of all current initiatives for its “regeneration” or “revitalization”. However, the problem lies in a lack of comprehension that any effort to “renew”, “enoble” or “embellish” this space, and to give it any kind of meaning or purpose other than memorial, implies a gradual and irrepressible erasing of Sajmište’s tragic past. By doing so, a new form of marginalization and oblivion is created in lieu of adequate remembrance of the camp’s victims and the site’s unique history.

Finally, it is worth pointing out that none of the aforementioned initiatives contain a clear and explicit attitude on what, in fact, the memorial museum envisaged at one of the pre-war pavilions, should be dedicated to. This institution – the only one which would mark the World War II period at the “revitalized” Sajmište – is mostly subject of vague discussions, without details on its content. There have been discussion about “museum of Holocaust victims”, “museum of Holocaust”, “museum of the camp”, “memorial center”, “national memorial center”, etc. The apparent lack of interest in the content of the museum or the memorial center represents yet another indication of World War II suffering as a second-rate issue compared to the preoccupation with the Old Fairground as a physical space. However, it is a subject of essential significance. From the 1960s to this day Sajmište has been an important symbolic space attributed by different communities with different meanings according to their own respective discretions, priorities and practical interests. Due to a link of often conflicting interpretations of the site’s history which are ongoing, Sajmište today abounds with symbolism but at the same time deprived of clear meaning. In other words, there may be agreement in Serbia on the fact that the memory of the Sajmište camp should be preserved, but not about what we actually should be remembering. Is it Sajmište as the site of civilian suffering in the occupied Serbia? Or as part of the “Jasenovac camp system”? Or as a symbol of the common suffering of Serbs and Jews? Or as a Holocaust site? Or as a camp located on the “territory of NDH” which consequently proves that “Serbs did not take part in the Holocaust”? Or as a symbol of antifascist ideals and freethinking spirit, even of tolerance in general?

56 Since 2008, the main ceremony marking the International Holocaust Remembrance Day has been taking place at the Old Fairground.
57 Another researcher who inquired about this issue at the Ministry was given a similar explanation from the same source. Interestingly, in both cases the source stated that the construction work at Autokomanda will be carried out by an Israeli company. This fact alone (presumably because the architect is Jewish) was sufficient guarantee to the authorities at the Ministry of Labor and Social Policy that the Holocaust victims would receive an appropriate monument.
This is a problem which will have to be tackled by relevant institutions and the society in general, sooner or later. The manner of doing so will determine whether the victims of Sajmište will finally receive a memorial site they deserve. If an effort is made in order to rectify past mistakes and reevaluate deeply rooted beliefs about Sajmište and its history and if there is willingness to work on a new, healthier culture of remembrance focused on the victims and based on historical facts, then there are reasons for optimism. Such an approach would certainly open the door to a new consideration of the Holocaust, one that would not view Jewish victims as the “first victims of Sajmište” or as the Serbs’ fellow sufferers, but perceive their systematic destruction as an unprecedented crime and unique aspect of the history of Sajmište (but also the history of Serbia in general) which as such deserves unreserved attention and respect. However, it is more likely that the decision-makers will eventually follow the path of least resistance, along the route of continuity with the past, by attempting to find the lowest common denominator among the existing, often controversial, ideologically colored interpretations or by simply turning Sajmište into a “symbolic place” of a general character, whose meaning will be left open for individual interpretation. In that case, the Holocaust will most certainly remain on the margins of collective memory and instead of an appropriate memorial site, the scene of the largest concentration camp in Serbia will become, or rather remain, merely a permanent reminder of past omissions and controversial policies which marked the past 65 years.
Roma in the Jewish Camp Zemun 1941-1942

Danijela Jovanović

DANIJELA JOVANOVIĆ (1975), historian, lives in Belgrade working as a freelance translator and writer.

World War II ended more than half a century ago, yet there are still ongoing debates on whether Roma were victims of the Holocaust. In our country, there is hardly any work dealing with this subject. For the most part, crimes committed against Roma are barely mentioned by authors. This is the main motivation behind this text, because victims must not be forgotten, especially when it comes to a nation that has been living with us, or better put, next to us, for centuries and suffered only because it was proclaimed an “inferior race”.

The exact number of murdered Roma is unknown because, living on the margins of European societies, they were never included in official statistics. It is assumed that the number of Roma victims surpasses half a million. There is no official data in Serbia, as well. According to some estimates, the number of victims is around 12,000.

The reason for the unknown exact number of victims is not only the lack of official statistics, but also a lack of genuine interest. This is best exemplified by the words of Ernest Rinald, a Roma from Salamanca and Buchenwald inmate:

“240,000 dead, that is a lot, after all. After the war had ended, they told me there were one million dead, 240,000 is a lot! And the Gypsies do not know that. But today things are changing. Many people want to get to know about their own history. Children are going to school. Nomadism will be over in fifty years. The history of our people will be then written by others. [The history] of our sufferin 240,000 dead, that is a lot, but it is nothing compared to what happened with us after arriving from India. Someday, my children will go to India. It is nothing, because we were always getting murdered. Without punishment. The Germans were punished because they lost. Had they won, the whole world would have applauded them. Nobody likes the Gypsies. Nobody cares about the Gypsies. Things are better today, but we are always frowned upon. They would look at us differently if they knew about our victims, 240,000 or them, or one million, that doesn’t change things. They keep forgetting that we are people, like them. As simple as that. After all that has happened, we have the right to live like others. In freedom. Like Gypsies.”

Today, there are claims that Roma were not persecuted for racial, but social reasons. A common excuse is that they were sent to camps as criminals and antisocial. In other words, they themselves are to be blamed for what has befallen them. Unfortunately, such opinion is widespread across the world, including our country. For the most part, our country is silent about this issue, which makes those events even more tragic. For example, the book Otpor u žicama (Resistance in Wires; edited by Lazar Ivanović and Mladen Vukomanović) which contains inmates’ testimonies in the chapter about the Sajmište camp, does not even mention Roma. In addition to that, many texts stress Serbs as the sole victims of the German harassment retaliation policy. Significantly, the Encyclopedia of Yugoslavia, published in 1983, does not contain an entry “Roma” and they were not even mentioned in the text about minorities, even though in 1977 the Commission on Human Rights issued the Geneva Resolution on recognizing Roma as an Indian historic, cultural and language minority

Danijela Jovanović

Romi u Jevrejskom Logoru Zemun 1941-1942

Danijela Jovanović (1975), istoričarka, živi u Beogradu i radi kao slobodna prevodilica i spisateljica.

Više od polovine veka je prošlo kako je završen Drugi svetski rat a još uvek se vode rasprave o tome da li su Romi bili žrtve Holokausta. U našoj zemlji radova koji se bave ovom temom gotovo da nema, autori, uglavnom, samo usputno pominju zločine koji su izvršeni nad Romima. Upravo to je razlog nastanka ovog rada jer žrtve ne smeju biti zaboravljene, naročito ako se radi o pripadnicima naroda koji već vekovima žive sa nama i koji su stradali samo zbog toga što su proglasljeni “nižom rasom”.


Razlog što nije poznat tačan broj poginulih Roma nije samo zbog toga što ne postoje zvanične statistike, već i zato što ne postoji stvarno interesovanje da se sazna. To najbolje potvrđuju reči Ernesta Rinalada, Roma iz Salamanke, logoraša Buchenvalda:


Danas su prisutne tvrdnje da Romi nisu proganjani iz rasnih već iz društvenih razloga. Izgovor koji je često prisutan jeste da su oni bili poslati u logore kao kriminalci i asocijalni, drugim rečima da su sami krivi za to što im se desilo. Nažalost, ovo shvatanje je veoma rašireno, kako u svetu, tako i kod nas. U našoj zemlji se o ovom pitanju uglavnom čuti, što čini da ti događaji dobiju još trajniju dimenziju. Kao dobar primer se može navesti to što se u knjizi Otpor u žicama, koja sadrži svedočenja logoraša, a koja je priredila Lazar Ivanović i Mladen Vukomanović, Romi uopšte ne pominju. Takođe, u mnogim radovima, kao žrtve nemačkih odmazdi nad taocima, uglavnom se navode samo Srbi. Važno je reći i to da u Enciklopediji Jugoslavije, u izdanju iz 1983., uopšte ne postoji odrednica „Romi”, i to da se oni ne pominju čak ni u tekstu o manjinama, iako je 1977. Komisija za ljudska prava u Ženevi izdala Rezoluciju po kojoj su Romi indijska, istorijska, kulturna i jezička manjina i da shodno tome, uživaju zaštitu i
which, accordingly, enjoys the protection and rights established by United Nations documents. The same encyclopedia, published in 1961, contains the entry “Gypsies” with a short text about their history. However, their suffering during World War II on the territory of Yugoslavia is summed up by these sentences:

“German occupiers and their domestic servants carried out a wholesale destruction of Gypsies in concentration camps. On the territory of Croatia, only those who found themselves on liberated territory were saved.”

The first part of this text brings a short overview of Roma history, from their migration to the Balkans to the beginning of World War II. The second part deals with the fascist ideology of race and its reception in Serbia, while the third part describes the plight of Roma in occupied Belgrade and at the Sajmište camp. Unfortunately, the lack of original material and literature prevents better analysis of these subjects.

The source material is unsystematic and scattered throughout various archives. The Military-Historical Institute’s Archive (The Nedić Archive) holds data pertaining to this subject but it is fragmented and insufficient. The German Archive at the same institution offers a large amount of information, but the majority of the documents were never translated from the German language. However, the Series of Documents and Data on the National Liberation War of the People of Yugoslavia does contain German occupation authorities’ documents, i.e. the published part of this archive’s material.

The Historical Archives of Belgrade hold the significant collection of M.G. – memories of Sajmište inmates, collection of posters and photographs, as well as the Municipal Archives of the City. The posters, as well as print media and all means of propaganda of the time prove that the then government had placed Jews at the top of their list of enemies. This is due to the fact that between two world wars Jews had occupied important positions in Serbian society and were pillars of the economy. On the other hand, Roma are rarely mentioned, for they were excluded from the state and social life and it is was thus probably considered that murdering them would not cause great public discontent. The collection of M.G. contains statements by only three Roma – Pavle and Milorad Dekić and Stevan Kostić. All three date from the 1980s. The question is why there are no lists of murdered Roma, since they were commonly taken to be shot without their names being called out, responding to the order: “All Gypsies outside”. The camp administration did not bother to document their names and ages.

Unlike foreign literature, Serbian texts scarcely contain information about this issue. Unfortunately, international literature is unavailable since very little has been done on translating and publishing work dealing with this or similar topics.
Today, there is an increased international tendency, primarily due to the joint efforts by Jewish and Roma associations, to provide equal treatment for Holocaust victims, i.e. to recognize each Holocaust victim, regardless of whether he/she is Jewish or Roma. In our country, this is still not the case.

As stated at the beginning, Serbian authors hardly even refer to crimes against Roma. This is probably because this people still lives on the margins of our society; it is still insufficiently emancipated and not “important” enough for someone to tackle the issue. Still, some progress has been visible during the last few years – however, again mostly due to the efforts by Roma associations in Serbia.

Roma on the Territory of Yugoslavia

“A wizard had warned the Indian king that the enemies would attack his kingdom and destroy his family. However, the attackers would be powerless if they assaulted the Roma. That is why the king summoned the Roma chief, secretly entrusting him with his only daughter Gan. She was supposed to be raised in safety by the chief, as his first child. Gan grew up sharing a tent with the chief’s son Chen. One day, the old chief died and the Roma tribe pressured the new chief Chen to get married right away. He refused every girl he was offered and threatened to kill himself because he only loved his sister. His mother then told him that Gan was not his sister but that he had to keep it a secret or else the conquerors would kill Gan, as she was the king’s daughter. The tribe was divided in two camps. The first one supported the new chief in everything while the second judged his marriage with his sister, not recognizing him as the tribe’s leader. The second camp banished Chen and his followers from the Indian land. Chen and his followers have been wandering the earth ever since, because the great wizard cast a curse on them: they were never to spend the night at the same place twice, never to drink water twice from the same well and never to cross the same river twice in the same year.”

As many others, this Roma myth attempts to explain events from their history. Unfortunately, the Roma people only left oral traces and no written ones, which is why its history represents a great mystery for both us and ourselves.

Ethnologists, linguists and historians agree that Roma are of Indian origins, but they are not certain which part of India was their homeland. It is assumed that their migration from the motherland was a result of frequent wars and invasions by various conquerors, primarily the Mongols in the 9th and 10th century. They migrated in the following direction: northern group – towards Iran and Afghanistan, to the Caspian Sea to the north and the Persian Gulf to the south. One group stayed in Turkey crossed the Bosphorus and arrived to the Balkans.

One group moved to Armenia; according to linguistic traces, it spent some time there before dividing into several groups and moving in different directions. One of the smaller groups went over the Caucasus to Russia and another continued towards Greece and the countries of the Balkan Peninsula. The southern group moved to the Tigris-Euphrates river system. Several tribes from this group went towards the Black Sea and the others to Syria. The majority of the tribes arrived to the Asian part of Turkey. The group furthest to the south continued along the Mediterranean Sea, crossing Palestine and Egypt, along the northern coast of Africa, all the way to Gibraltar and Spain. The group that stayed in Turkey crossed the Bosphorus and arrived to the Balkans.

Roma in the Jewish Camp


Ovaj romski mit, kao i mnogi drugi, pokušava da objasni događaje iz njihove istorije. Nažalost, Roma su narod koji nije ostvario pisane tragove o sebi, već samo usmene, tako da je njihova istorija velika nepoznanica kako drugim narodima, tako i njima samima.

Roma first appeared in this region as early as in the 11th century, but their massive immigration coincided with the arrival of Turkish conquerors in the 14th century. During the medieval feudal period, Roma were equal inhabitants of the Yugoslav region, although in documents they were always branded by the term “Gipsy” which marked their nationality. Also, during this period they lived in settlements mixed with other peoples. It is therefore assumed that there was no form of social and ethnic hostility towards Roma at the time.

The period between the 15th and the 19th century brought great social changes. It was the time of Turkish feudalism when many Roma in the Yugoslav countries converted to Islam, mostly because of benefits. This period also marks the beginning of their separation from the local population, even in the physical form, for they began living in separate mahalas. Besides, it was a time when nations were being created and national consciousness was awakening, which had a very profound influence on the local population’s attitude towards Roma. Their separateness was also influenced by Turkish legislation which forbade the intermingling of Muslim and Christian Roma.

In medieval times, Roma in the Yugoslav region most commonly practiced crafts and merchant ship, particularly blacksmithing, followed by merchant and music. During the Turkish period, as well, the most widespread profession among Roma was craftsmanship, particularly blacksmithing, followed by merchant and music.

In the 19th century, the majority of Roma lived in the Belgrade district, while the second-largest population inhabited the Kragujevac district. It is assumed that 12,000 Roma had lived in the mid-19th century Serbia.

In a letter to the Belgrade Metropolitan in 1819, Prince Miloš Obrenović said the Metropolitan should not take “divnice” from the Gypsies, because this has never been done before; we should not embarrass ourselves by equaling the Gypsies with us. This clearly shows the attitude towards Roma, even back then.

The 1869 Constitution, Article 46 and the Elections Law, Article 18, banned Travellers from taking part in electing people’s deputies, because they were paying harač rather than regular taxes. The so-called “Gypsy harač” was abolished in 1884, thus putting Roma and the Serbian population on equal footing. Still, this was no true equality since Roma were a completely separate national group. This has very much to do with the fact that during the Turkish rule they lived in separate mahalas, which did have a positive side since they preserved their ethnic cohesion, but on the other hand they became isolated from other social communities.

Na našim prostorima, Romi su se pojavili već u XI veku, mada masovno dolaze tek sa turskim osvajачima u XIV veku. U srednjevekovno feudalno doba, na jugoslovenskom prostoru, Romi su bili ravnopravni žitelji, mada se u dokumentima uz njihovo ime uvek navodila narodnosna oznaka „Ciganin”. Takođe, u tom periodu, oni su živeli izmešani sa ostalim stanovništvom u naseljima. Znaci da se u to vreme ne može govoriti o nekom socijalnom i etničkom neprijateljstvu prema njima.

U periodu od XV-XIX veka dolazi do velikih društvenih i socijalnih promena. To je doba vladavine turskog feudalizma, kada mnogi Romi u jugoslovenskim zemljama primaju islam, prevenstveno zbog povlastica. Tada počinje i njihovo odvajanje od lokalnog stanovništva, čak i fizičko, jer počinju da žive u posebnim mahalama. Sem toga, to je period stvaranja nacija i bađenja nacionalne svesti, što je veoma mnogo uticalo i na odnos lokalnog stanovništva prema Romima. Takođe, na njihovu podvojenost su uticale i turske zakonske odredbe kojima je bilo zabranjeno mešanje Roma muslimana i hrišćana.

U srednjem veku, na jugoslovenskom prostoru Romi su se uglavnom bavili zanatstvom i trgovanom. U turskom periodu, takođe, najrasprostranjenije zanimanje medu Romima je bilo zanatstvo, i to prevenstveno kovacki zanat, zatim, sitna trgovina i bavljenje muzikom.

U XIX veku najviše Roma je bilo u beogradskom okrugu, a potom u kragujevačkom. Pretpostavlja se da je u Srbiji polovinom XIX veka njihov broj iznosio 12.000.

Iz pisma kneza Miloša Obrenovića, upućenog beogradskom mitropolitu 1819., u kojem stoji da mitropolit ne uzima „divnice od Cigana, koje pre nikada bivalo nije, da se nama stid ne pričinjava sravljujući Cigana s nama“, jasno se vidi kakav je bio odnos prema Romima već tada.

Ustav iz 1869., član 46, i Skupštinski izborni zakon, član 18, zabranili su Romima-čergarima učešće u biranju narodnih poslanika, jer nisu plaćali porez već harač. 1884. je ukinut ovaj tzv. „Ciganski harač“ i time su Romi izjednačeni sa srpskim stanovništvom. Ali o stvarnoj jednakosti se ne može govoriti, jer su Romi predstavljali potpuno izdvojenu narodnu skupinu. Tome je u velikoj meri doprinelo to što su oni u vreme turske vlasti živeli u posebnim mahalama. To je imalo i izvesnu pogodnost, jer su sačuvali svoju etničku jedinstvenost, ali s druge strane, postali su izolovani od drugih socijalnih sredina.
According to the 1921 census, 34,919 Roma lived in Serbia, although it is assumed that the number was much higher because many did not declare themselves to be of Roma ethnicity. Most of them lived in Northern Serbia – 16,670, followed by 14,489 in Southern Serbia with Kosovo and Macedonia, 3,104 in Banat and Bačka and 652 in Baranja. The majority of the Roma population lived in towns, practicing merchanty, craftsmanship and, of course, music. What was their status like in the period of Kingdom?

The Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes 1921 Constitution regulated the issue of minorities in the following manner: all citizens of the Kingdom were declared equal; they all had the same rights; freedom of religion and conscience was guaranteed and Article 16 provided minorities of different race and language with the right for elementary education in their respective mother tongue. This means that all rights were guaranteed for the minorities, at least formally. However, this was not practically implemented, as confirmed by the 1931 Oktroisani Constitution which did not even refer to minorities. It was probably due to the fact that elementary education in minority languages was not established before the 1929 Law on People’s Schools. According to this Law, education in minority languages was an exception, save for places where citizens who used other languages comprised the majority. The only school for Roma children where classes were held in the Romani language was founded in Apatin in 1913. However, it only existed until the beginning of World War I. There were several unsuccessful attempts to reestablish it between two wars.

At this point, it is important to emphasize that Roma were not enlisted among national minorities, which means that they were not able to enjoy their rights, even formally. The Kingdom only recognized the status of national minority to the Hungarian, German, Italian, Romanian, Slovakian and Czech national groups.

During the 1920s and 1930s, there were noticeable attempts to organize the Roma population in neighboring countries, too. A congress took place in Bucharest in 1933 with the purpose to establish a congress in praksi, potvrđuje i Oktroisani ustav iz 1931., u kojem manjine uočite nisu pomenute. Venovatno je razlog bilo to što je osnovno školovanje na jezicima manjina uvedeno tek 1929., Zakonom o narodnim školama. Ovim zakonom, nastava na jezicima manjina je bila izuzetak, sem u mjestima gde su u većini živeli državljani drugog jezika. Jedina škola koja je bila predviđena za romsku decu, i u kojoj je nastava bila vođena na romskom jeziku, osnovana je u Apatinu 1913. Ona je radila samo do početka Prvog svetskog rata. Nekoliko puta, u međuratnom periodu, bilo je pokušaja da se njen rad obnovi, ali bez uspeha.

Ovde je važno reći da Romi nisu ubrajani u nacionalne manjine, znači da čak ni formalno nisu mogli da ostvare svoja prava. Kraljevina je priznavao samo mađarsku, nemačku, italijansku, rumunsku, slovačku i čeku narodnu grupu, status nacionalne manjine.

Dvadesetih i tridesetih godina se mogu primetiti pokušaji organizovanja Roma i u okolnim zemljama. 1933. je održan kongres u Bukureštu radi osnivanja međunarodne organizacije Roma. Tada se javila i ideja o vraćanju u stari zavičaj, Indiju, i stvaranju romske države na obalama Ganga ili u severnoj Africi. Međutim, 1936. rumunske vlasti su zabranile svaku dalju delatnost ove organizacije.

Tekst Tihomira Đorđevića iz 1904.g na najbolji način oslikava položaj Roma kao i odnos odnos države prema njima početkom ali i kroz ceo XX vek.

“Što ima u Cigana gresaka, ne treba za sve kriviti njih same, jer za njih nikada ništa činjeno nije. U većim zemljama oni su samo ponižavani, pogani i kažnjavani. Pokušaji civilizacijen nisu nigde, pa ni u Srba činjeno. Ako je što i činjeno, to je bilo nasilno ili prativno njihovoj prirodi.”


Ustavom Kraljevine SHS iz 1921., pitanje manjina je bilo regulisano na sledeći način: svi državljani Kraljevine su progašeni jednakim; svi su uočili istu pravu; bila je zagradovana sloboda vere i savesti, a članom 16, manjima druge rase i jezika je dato pravo na osnovno školovanje na njihovom maternom jeziku. Znači, formalno, manjinama su bila zagradovana sva prava. Međutim, to se nije sprovedilo u praksi, potvrđuje i Oktroisani ustav iz 1931., u kojem manjine uočite nisu pomenute. Venovatno je razlog bilo to što je osnovno školovanje na jezicima manjina uvedeno tek 1929., Zakonom o narodnim školama. Ovim zakonom, nastava na jezicima manjina je bila izuzetak, sem u mjestima gde su u većini živeli državljani drugog jezika. Jedina škola koja je bila predviđena za romsku decu, i u kojoj je nastava bila vođena na romskom jeziku, osnovana je u Apatinu 1913. Ona je radila samo do početka Prvog svetskog rata. Nekoliko puta, u međuratnom periodu, bilo je pokušaja da se njen rad obnovi, ali bez uspeha.

Ovde je važno reći da Romi nisu ubrajani u nacionalne manjine, znači da čak ni formalno nisu mogli da ostvare svoja prava. Kraljevina je priznavao samo mađarsku, nemačku, italijansku, rumunsku, slovačku i čeku narodnu grupu, status nacionalne manjine.

Dvadesetih i tridesetih godina se mogu primetiti pokušaji organizovanja Roma i u okolnim zemljama. 1933. je održan kongres u Bukureštu radi osnivanja međunarodne organizacije Roma. Tada se javila i ideja o vraćanju u stari zavičaj, Indiju, i stvaranju romske države na obalama Ganga ili u severnoj Africi. Međutim, 1936. rumunske vlasti su zabranile svaku dalju delatnost ove organizacije.

Tekst Tihomira Đorđevića iz 1904.g na najbolji način oslikava položaj Roma kao i odnos odnos države prema njima početkom ali i kroz ceo XX vek.

“The Gypsies should not be blamed for their own flaws, since nothing was ever done for them. In any country, they were only humiliated, persecuted and punished. There had never been attempts to civilize them, and this includes Serbia. If anything was being done, it was violent or against their nature.”
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Today, they are equal to the Serbs before the law, but they are not accustomed to those rights, they do not recognize them, because they don’t know the essence or benefits of those rights and no one takes this into account. They are wanted for the army taxes, forced labor and so on, but their children are not wanted in schools and they tacitly exclude themselves from enjoying many rights. They are represented by no one and nowhere because nobody wants to take care about the Gypsies. Therefore, it is not surprising that the Gypsies are different in everything, that they do not consider religion to be something permanent and necessary, that they possess characteristics harmful to the environment, that they do not understand what others do, that the Serbs' homeland is not an ideal of theirs and that they do not enjoy the same things as Serbs. All that is foreign to them, making them different and alienated.  

There were attempts to organize Roma, especially between two wars, in our country as well as in neighboring ones. However, the outbreak of World War II put to a halt to further activities for a very long period.  

Following the April War, military administration was introduced in Serbia. It was led by a German general with his staff. Administrative affairs were conducted by the Administrative Headquarters headed by a military-administrative official. Military affairs were in the jurisdiction of the Command Headquarters. The Serbian Military Commander’s Headquarters included the General Plenipotentiary of the Ministry of Interior who advised the Military Commander on matters from Command Headquarters. The Serbian Military Commander’s Headquarters included the General Plenipotentiary of the Ministry of Interior who advised the Military Commander on matters from his jurisdiction. This way, an entire network was created, comprised of offices subordinated to their respective higher authorities in Berlin.  

By establishing an occupation system, the Germans introduced their own laws, including the ones concerning racial issues. One of the first such decrees with the force of law was adopted on May 31 1941 by the Military Commander of Serbia, depriving Jews and Roma of their civil rights.  

One wonders how these measures were accepted and whether they were preceded by political groups and movements in Serbia which supported this ideology.  

Fascist movements and organizations had been emerging in the Kingdom as early as in the 1920s. In that period, they were autochthonous, i.e. they developed completely independent of outside influence. Those were the following organizations: “Organization of Yugoslav Nationalists“ (Orjuna), “Serbian National Youth“ (Srmao), “Croatian National Youth“ (Hanao), etc. Some of them became influenced by German and Italian fascism during the 1930s. Nationalism was at the center of all of these organizations' and movements' ideologies, as it had been for a long time the dominant principle for the majority of ideologies. The causes should be sought in the social and economic situation – the country was underdeveloped, agricultural, with an industry that was only beginning to develop and a society predominantly comprised of patriarchal peasantry. In such a so-
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ciety, nationalism became a form of outlet for solving accumulated problems. Still, fascism cannot be considered a system of governance in Yugoslavia during the 1920s and 1930s. There were some elements of the fascist model in terms of governance, such as the militarization of power, abolition of parliamentaryism, banning of political parties and so on, but the regime was not a fascist one, mainly due to the fact that it was not widely supported. Besides, it did not rely on fascist movements, which is the basic precondition for the creation of a fascist state. Only after the occupation did fascism become the basis of the governance system.

In occupied Serbia, the “Zbor” organization was the most fanatic supporter of the “New Order” policy, but also helped implement it. It was founded in 1935 as a merger of several organizations and groups – “Yugoslav Action”, “Boj” and groups affiliated with the “Zbor”, “Oradžabina” and “Budenje”. In 1937 they were joined by the movement of Volksdeutsche, i.e. the so-called right wing of “Kulturbund”. Members of “Zbor” were part of the occupation apparatus as armed volunteer units directly subordinated to SS forces.

The organization was led by Dimitrije Ljotić who also helped attract a part of the Orthodox clergy to “Zbor”. By relying on a part of the clergy and engraving certain Orthodox-mystical features into the national program, the fascism of “Zbor” took on very specific characteristics, distinguishing it from German and Italian types of fascism. This form of religious racism and fanaticism found fertile ground among the people.

This is part of a Vidovdan 1939 speech by Žiča Bishop Nikolaj Velimirović (today canonized as St. Nikolai) organized by the movement of god-prayers called “Christian People’s Movement”, a great stronghold of Ljotić’s:

“We are members of a great Slavic family which spent centuries watchfully keeping guard at the gates of Europe and preventing tribes of a weaker race and inferior religion from disturbing the christened Europe in its peaceful development and advancement. We are a christened people; we are Aryans by blood, Slavs by last name, Serbs by first name and Christians by heart and soul.”
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slavery under the Turks, as some primitive, backward form of pre-state life. It is an original, unlearned form, stemming from racial character, through which the Serbs achieved their ideas of social organization, order in the society, system of their national life."

In the majority of their articles and speeches, the supporters of Ljotic and Nedic did not explicitly speak against Roma, but their attitude towards them is clearly illustrated by their emphasis of the "Serbian race" and dream of an ethnically clean Serbian state.

Roma at the Sajmište Camp 1941-1942

One of the first measures adopted against the Jews and Roma after the occupation of Serbia was the May 31 1941 order by the Military Commander of Serbia which regulated their position, depriving them of their civil rights. This order equaled Roma with Jews, which meant that they had to wear a yellow ribbon with the word "Gipsy" on their left arm. They were also banned from performing public services, as well as a range of professions; all Roma older than 14 or 15, both male and female, were obligated to perform forced labor, they were banned from theaters and all other recreational facilities; their freedom of movement was restricted and they had to stay at their homes between 8 p.m. and 6 a.m., along with many other bans. The order also clearly specified which persons were to be considered Roma: all who were offspring of at least three Roma ancestors. This category included persons of mixed ancestry, with one or two Roma ancestors, as well as men married to a Roma woman. In addition to this, Roma had to be registered in so-called "Gipsy Lists". The implementation of this order was assigned to the Serbian authorities. The quisling commissary administration ordered the local authorities to exclude Roma with a permanent residence from the arrests and apprehend only Travellers. However, this order was not observed.

After the Third Reich's attack on the Soviet Union on June 22 1941, a wide-scale destruction of Roma and Jews began in Serbia, along with strong media propaganda aiming to justify those crimes.

This is an article published by "Novo Vreme" on September 27 1941 entitled "Serbs, Join the Ranks of Volunteers":

"You will save the country from anarchy, devastation and hunger. Mercenaries of the Red Bolshevik Moscow, led by Jews, with gangs of escaped convicts, Gypsies and other plunderers are demolishing and burning, murdering innocent people, robbing private family properties and property and aiming to inflict misery on the country of Serbia – our Fatherland – and to push the entire Serbian people into the abyss. Serbia was peaceful until June 22, people were returning to their work and rebuilding the severely damaged country. Sabotages, murders and crimes occurred only after the beginning of the war against Bolshevik Moscow on June 22. It is clear, then, who is responsible for this."

A September 18 1941 report by the Head of the Feldkommandantur 599 to the Commander of Serbia about the military-political situation in Belgrade in the period from September 9 to September 18 1941 reads:

"Vi ćete spasiti zemlju od anarhije, pistošenja i gladi. Plaćenici i poklonici Crvene boljševičke Moskve, predvođene Jevrejima, sa bandama odbeglih robija, Cigana i drugih pljačkaša, ruše i pale, ubijaju nevine ljude, pljačkuju i odnose privatnu domaćinsku narodnu imovinu i hoće da u crno zaviju zemlju Srbiju – našu Opatištinu, i da u puna propast bace ces srpski narod. Do 22. juna Srbija je bila mirna, narod se vraćao radu i obnovu teško nastradale zemlje. Tek posle 22. juna, posle početak rata sa boljševičkom Moskom, počele su sabotaze, ubistva i zločini. Jasno je onda za čiji se račun sve to radi."

Izvestaj komandanta feldkomandatur 599 od 18.09.1941., predat komandantu Srbije, o vojno-političkoj situaciji u Beogradu za period od 9-18. 09. 1941. godine. glasi:

U većini članaka i govora, pristalice Ljotic i Nedića, ne govore izričito protiv Roma, ali njihovo isticanje „srpske rase” i njihov san o etnički čistoj srpskoj državi, daju sasvim to o tome kakav je bio njihov odnos prema Romima.

Romi u Logoru na Sajmištu 1941 - 1942.


Članak iz Novog vremena od 27.09.1941., čiji je naslov „Srbi, stupajte u redove dobrovoljaca”:

"Roma in the Jewish Camp."
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“The work-shy, Gypsies and vagabonds were also arrested and partially exiled”44.

This means that the majority of Roma were arrested as early as in September. On September 21 1941, Turner sent an official report to General Böhme, suggesting the arrest of Jews and Roma:47

“Also, the arrest of all Jews, as well as Gypsies, which is already in progress, should be carried out in a much harsher form...”

In accordance with that, further arrests of Roma followed in October in a series of raids in Belgrade and its surroundings – Marinkova bara on October 27, Čubura and Jatagan-Mali; Bulbuder, Pašino Brdo, Mirijevo and Višnija on October 29; Zarkovo on October 30 and Boleč on October 3148. The majority of the arrested Roma were taken to the Autokomanda camp and the last group was interned in the Banja camp49.

The October 26 1941 order by the Plenipotentiary Commanding General in Serbia Turner placed male Jews and Roma at the troops' disposal as hostages:50

“We should start with the principled position that Jews and Gypsies in general represent an unreliable element and thus a jeopardy for the public order and safety. The Jewish intellect started this war in the first place – it must be destroyed. Given their spiritual and physical constitution, Gypsies cannot be considered useful members of the community of peoples. It has been proven that the Jewish element took a significant part in leading gangs and that the Gypsies are responsible for terrible brutalities and providing of intelligence services. Therefore, all male Jews and Gypsies are to be placed at the troops' disposal as hostages. Besides, there are plans to soon intern Jewish and Gypsy women and children in a temporary camp thus relocating this element of unrest and removing it from the Serbian public space. This requires necessary preparations.”

However, a report by the German police from October 9 1941 shows that the execution of Roma and Jewish hostages had become common practice even prior to Turner's order46.

“Pri akciji čišćenja koji je preduzela nemačka vojska na prostoru Šabca, dosad je dovela zarobljenih 22 000 muškaraca. Oni su smešteni u jedno odeljenje policije bezbednosti samo da stavlja na raspolaganje potreban broj.”

The cleansing action performed by the German Army in the Šabac area has thus far resulted with 22,000 captured men. They were interned in a temporary camp where they are now being investigated by a Security Police department with the assistance of the Belgrade police. 2100 Jews and Gypsies will be shot as reprisal for 21 German soldiers killed near Topola a few days ago. The executions will be performed by the German Army. The Security Police is only tasked with providing the necessary number of prisoners.”

Report No. 2 on the activity of the 704th Infantry Division from October 27 1941 testifies about the executions of Jewish and Roma hostages in Belgrade as reprisal for killed and wounded German soldiers52.

“The 9th Company of the 433rd Infantry Regiment is executing Jews and Gypsies in Belgrade, as reprisal for killed and wounded German soldiers.”
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Žena je značajno naredbeno doktora Turnera, opunomoćenog komandujućeg generala u Srbiji, od 26.10.1941. kojom su Jevreji i Romi, muškarci, stavljeni trupama na raspolaganje kao taoci:45

„Treba poći od načelnih postavki da su Jevreji i Cigani uspode nepouzdan elemenat i da samim tim pretstavljaju opasnost za javni poriad i sigurnost. Jevrejski intelekt je taj koji je začevo svoj rat, on se mora uništiti. Cigani ne mogu biti korisni članovi zajednice naroda s obzirom na njihovu dubovinu i fizičku gradu. Utvrđeno je da je jevrejski elemenat uzeo značajnog učešća u vodstvu bandi a da su hal Cigani odgovorni za naročita zverstva i za obavljanje obaveštajne službe. Stoga se načelno u svakom slučaju ima staviti na raspolaganje trupi kao taoci ovaj muškarci Jevreji i Cigani. Uostalom, postoji namera da se žene i deca Jevreja i Cigana uskoro prikupe u sabirni logor i da se ovaj elemenat nemira iseli i time otkloni iz srpskog prostora. Po ovome treba preduzeti potrebne pripreme.”

Međutim, iz izveštaja nemačke policijske službe od 09.10.1941., može se videti da je streljanje Roma i Jevreja, kao taoca, već postalo praksu, pre naredbenog dr. Turnera.46

„Prij akciji čišćenja koji je preduzela nemačka vojska na prostoru Sačka, dosad je dovela zarobljenih 22 000 muškaraca. Oni su smešteni u jedan odeljenje policijskih vojnika u Topoli. Do danas stigla je streljana 2100 Jevreja i Cigana. Streljanje će vratiti nemačka vojska. Zadatak je policije bezbednosti samo da izvodi na stupanj potreban broj.”

Izveštaj broj 2. o delatnosti 704. pešadijske divizije od 27.oktobra 1941. svedoči o streljanju Jevreja i Roma u Beogradu, uzetih kao taoca, u cilju odmazde za poginule i ranjene nemačke vojnike.47

„Deveta četa 433 pešadijskog puka strelja u Beogradu Jevreje i Cigane kao odmazdu za poginule i ranjene nemačke vojnike”.48

43 Zbornik dokumenata i podataka o Narodnooslobodilačkoj ratu naroda Jugoslavije, XII, knjiga 1, 413.
44 Isto, 448.
46 Isto.
47 Zbornik NOR I/1, 564-566.
48 Isto, I/1, 498-499.
49 Isto, 448.

Danijela Jovanović
Roma in the Jewish Camp
The mass executions of Jews and Roma – hostages taken from the Belgrade Autokomanda camp – are also confirmed in a report by Lt. Walter of the 9th Company of the 433rd Infantry Regiment. They were carried out on October 27 and 30, 1941 at a location north of Pančevo, close to the Pančevo-Jabuka road.50

‘In agreement with an authorized SS organ, I brought selected Jews and Gypsies from the Belgrade prisoner camp. Lorries from the Feldkommandantur 59 given at my disposal proved inadequate for two reasons:

1. The drivers are civilians, therefore secrecy is not guaranteed.

2. They have neither a roof nor tarpaulin so the city’s inhabitants could see who was being transported and where to. The Jewish wives gathered in front of the camp, yelling and screaming as we departed.

The location of the executions is very adequate. It lies north of Pančevo, along the Pančevo-Jabuka road in the vicinity of a steep hill which makes climbing very difficult. There is swampy land near the hill and a river is in the back. When the water level is high, it almost reaches the hill. Therefore, the prisoners’ escape can be prevented with the use of only few men. Also, the location has convenient sandy ground, making it easier to dig graves and shortening working hours.

After arriving at about 1.5 or 2 kilometers from the selected location, the prisoners stepped down from the lorry. Then, in order to secure secrecy and safety, I stopped traffic on the road.

The shooting of Jews is easier than the shooting of Gypsies. I must confess that the Jews look death in the eye in a very composed manner. They are drže MIRNO, whereas the Gypsies moan and scream although they are already at the site of execution. Some of them even jumped into the graves and played dead before the bullet.

At first, the executions did not leave a particular impression on my soldiers, but already on the second day it was noticeable that some of them lose their nerve when performing them for longer periods of time. According to my personal impression, no emotional disturbances occur during the shooting. However, they set in after a few days, during reflective evenings in solitude.’

Apparently, there were almost no living Jewish and Roma men to be used as hostages by early November 1941. It is assumed that at least 2,500 Roma men were murdered in Serbia during the fall of 1941.51

After the execution of male Jews and Roma, German authorities planned to intern their families to the “Serbian island of Mitrovica” where a temporary camp was to be built. “This camp will be built by the Todt Organization. At first it will have a capacity for 50,000 persons, which could be increased to 500,000. The camp will be modeled after German concentration camps. It will be administered by SS and SD Einsatzgruppen.”

However, due to the high water level of the Sava River and the land’s transformation into a swamp, the plan was abandoned.52

The mass executions of Jews and Roma – hostages taken from the Belgrade Autokomanda camp – are also confirmed in a report by Lt. Walter of the 9th Company of the 433rd Infantry Regiment. They were carried out on October 27 and 30, 1941 at a location north of Pančevo, close to the Pančevo-Jabuka road.50

‘In agreement with an authorized SS organ, I brought selected Jews and Gypsies from the Belgrade prisoner camp. Lorries from the Feldkommandantur 59 given at my disposal proved inadequate for two reasons:

1. The drivers are civilians, therefore secrecy is not guaranteed.

2. They have neither a roof nor tarpaulin so the city’s inhabitants could see who was being transported and where to. The Jewish wives gathered in front of the camp, yelling and screaming as we departed.

The location of the executions is very adequate. It lies north of Pančevo, along the Pančevo-Jabuka road in the vicinity of a steep hill which makes climbing very difficult. There is swampy land near the hill and a river is in the back. When the water level is high, it almost reaches the hill. Therefore, the prisoners’ escape can be prevented with the use of only few men. Also, the location has convenient sandy ground, making it easier to dig graves and shortening working hours.

After arriving at about 1.5 or 2 kilometers from the selected location, the prisoners stepped down from the lorry. Then, in order to secure secrecy and safety, I stopped traffic on the road.

The shooting of Jews is easier than the shooting of Gypsies. I must confess that the Jews look death in the eye in a very composed manner. They are drže MIRNO, whereas the Gypsies moan and scream although they are already at the site of execution. Some of them even jumped into the graves and played dead before the bullet.

At first, the executions did not leave a particular impression on my soldiers, but already on the second day it was noticeable that some of them lose their nerve when performing them for longer periods of time. According to my personal impression, no emotional disturbances occur during the shooting. However, they set in after a few days, during reflective evenings in solitude.’

Apparently, there were almost no living Jewish and Roma men to be used as hostages by early November 1941. It is assumed that at least 2,500 Roma men were murdered in Serbia during the fall of 1941.51

After the execution of male Jews and Roma, German authorities planned to intern their families to the “Serbian island of Mitrovica” where a temporary camp was to be built. “This camp will be built by the Todt Organization. At first it will have a capacity for 50,000 persons, which could be increased to 500,000. The camp will be modeled after German concentration camps. It will be administered by SS and SD Einsatzgruppen.”

However, due to the high water level of the Sava River and the land’s transformation into a swamp, the plan was abandoned.52

O masovnom streljanju Jevreja i Roma, kao taoca, uzetih iz beogradskog logora na Autokomandi, svedoći i izveštaj poručnika Voltera iz 9. čete 433. pešadijskog puca, koje je izvršeno 27. i 30.10.1941. na mestu koje leži severno od Pančevo, neposredno uz put Pančevo-Jabuka.50

„U sporazumu sa nadležnim organom SS dovezao sam probrane Jevreje, odnosno Cigane, iz beogradskog zarobljeničkog logora. Kamioni iz feldkomandature 599, koji su mi za ovo bili stavljeni na raspolaganje, pokazali su se nepogodnim iz dva razloga:

1. Vozle ih civili, ušed toga nije zajamcena tajna.

2. Svi su bili bez krova ili cerade, tako da je gradsko stanovništvo videlo koga smo na vozilima imali i kada smo se zatim vozili. Pred logorni su se bele skupile žene Jevreja, koje su urlikale i vikale pri naiem odlasku.

Mesto na kome je izvršeno streljanje, vrlo je podesno. Ono leži severno od Pančevoa, neposredno uz drum Pančevo-Jabuka, na kome se nalazi jedna uzvišica, čiji je nagib tolik da se na nju može čovek samo s mukom uspeti. Prema toj uzvišici nalazi se močvarno zemljište, a pozadi je reka. Pri visokom vodostaju voda dopire skoro do uzvišice. Prema tome, može se s male ljudi sprečiti bekstvo zarobljenika. Isto tako, tome je i podesno peskovito zemljište, što olakšava kopanje jama, a time se skraćuje radno vreme oko kopanja.

Po dolasku na oko 1.5-2 kilometra ispred izabranih mesta, zarobljenici su svi ilili s kamiona. Zatim sam, da bi bila obezbedena sigurnost i tajna, obustavio svaki saobraćaj drumom.

Streljanje Jevreja je jednostavnije nego streljanje Ciganja. Mora se priznati da Jevreji vrlo priobrazbom gledaju smrti u oči. Oni se drže mirno, dok Ciganji jaqule, vištše, tako se nalaze već na mestu streljanja. Nikši su čak pre plutom poskakali u jame i pokušali da se pritaje kao mrtvi.

Ovo streljanje u početku nije ostavljalo na moje vojne neki naročit utisak, ali se već drugog dana primetilo da poneki od njih, pri vrešenju streljanja na duže vreme, gube živce. Za vreme trajanja streljanja, po mom ličnom izmišljaju, ne osećaju se niakve duševne smetnje. One se, međutim, pojavljaju onda kada se postoji nekoliko dana uveće i u miru o tome razmišlja.”

Čini se da početkom novembra 1941. skoro da nije bilo više živih muškaraca Jevreja i Roma koji bi poslužili kao taoci. Pretpostavlja se da je u jesen 1941. u Srbiji stradal 2.500 romskih muškaraca.51

Plan nemačkih vlasti je bio da posle streljanja Jevreja i Roma, muškaraca, njihove porodice interniraju na „spsko ostrovo Mitrovica”, gde bi se podigao sabirni logor. „Osaj logor podići će organizacija Tot. Za prvo vreme imao bi kapacitet za 50.000 lica, da bi se mogao pomoći u 500.000. Logor će biti izgrađen prema uzoru na nemačke koncentracione logore. Uprava logora će biti u rukama ajznar-grupe političke bezbednosti i službe bezbednosti.”52

Međutim, zbog visokog vodostaja Save i pretvaranja zemljišta u močvaru, odustalo se od toga i..."
All Jews and Gypsies will be taken to a concentration camp near Zemun (Around 16,000 persons for the time being). It can be proven that they had performed intelligence services for the rebels.54. This is a part of a December 5 1941 report by the German Military Commander in Serbia which confirms that a decision had been made to create the Sajmište camp. The internment in the camp began on December 8 1941.

The December 20 1941 ten-day report by the Plenipotentiary Commander’s Operations Division specifies that “5,281 persons were brought to the newly formed camp for Jews and Gypsies in Zemun until December 15 1941”.55

In order to turn Sajmište into a camp, the Germans had to seek approval from the Independent State of Croatia, since the Sajmište site, as well as the entire Eastern Srem, was included in the territory of this newly formed state as of October 10 1941. The Germans were granted permission, as the only condition was to supply the camp from Serbian rather than Croatian territory. The territory of this newly formed state as of October 10 1941. The Germans were granted permission, with the condition that they supply the camp with supplies from Serbian rather than Croatian territory.56

The camp was under Gestapo command. Untersturmführer SS Herbert Andorfer and Scharführer SS Edgar Enge were in charge.57 The Germans delegated camp administration to the Jews, keeping the supervision. The Jewish administration was in charge of preparing food from supplies delivered to the camp by the Belgrade Municipality, ensuring order and maintaining hygiene, handling correspondence with the Nedić government regarding acquisition of food, etc. The Social Department of the Belgrade Municipality was in charge of acquiring supplies and delivering them to the camp, while the quantities were proscribed by the Germans.58

Around 600 Roma were brought to the camp, mostly from Belgrade, but also Travellers and Roma from Vojvodina.59 They were registered and interned in Pavilion No. 2.

The camp was under Gestapo command. Untersturmführer SS Herbert Andorfer and Scharführer SS Edgar Enge were in charge.57 The Germans delegated camp administration to the Jews, keeping the supervision. The Jewish administration was in charge of preparing food from supplies delivered to the camp by the Belgrade Municipality, ensuring order and maintaining hygiene, handling correspondence with the Nedić government regarding acquisition of food, etc. The Social Department of the Belgrade Municipality was in charge of acquiring supplies and delivering them to the camp, while the quantities were proscribed by the Germans.58

Around 600 Roma were brought to the camp, mostly from Belgrade, but also Travellers and Roma from Vojvodina.59 They were registered and interned in Pavilion No. 2.

“We were put in a hangar, an airplane hangar, large and empty, like some sort of a shed; we could see the sky, everything was ruined. There were beds with three or four tiers. I cannot remember exactly. I only remember that we were on the third one. They were made of wood, boards in a circle and nothing else. Next to the Jews, yes, a large pavilion, but it was all open, without a furnace or an oven. It was already full, they had left earlier, there were families. Only Roma were in this pavilion, a separate one just for Roma. And the weather at the time; I think there were around 700 or 800 of the, including women and children. Women and children; and there were some capos who handed out food. [There were inmates] from the Belgrade area, only Žarkovo, Mirijevo, Resnik and Višnjica, as far as I can remember. No one guaranteed for grade area, only Žarkovo, Mirijevo, Resnik and Višnjica, as far as I can remember. No one guaranteed for

...
Since there was no separate administration for Roma, one of the imprisoned women from the Jewish administration was selected to take care of the “Gypsy camp.”

Most of the Belgrade Roma had a permanent residence but the municipalities would not guarantee for them so many were taken to Sajmište, as Travellers. The camp’s inmates included women with children, while children over the age of 14 were taken to the Banjica camp.

Living conditions at the Roma part of the camp were much harsher than in the Jewish part. This is a statement by Charlotte Roth to the State Commission for Investigating Crimes of the Occupying Forces and their Helpers on June 19, 1947:

“The food was very bad. While I was at Sajmište in December and early January, the food was sent by the Belgrade Municipality. I later heard that it became much worse. In the morning – a cup of warm water which the Germans called coffee and which we had to wait for in line for hours. For lunch – a ⅛ liter of mostly cabbage, usually rotten and cooked in suet. We were supposed to get supper, as well, but due to a lack of caldrons, a part of the inmates got lunch and the others got supper. There were only three or four instances when I received both lunch and supper on the same day. In the beginning, we were given bread but after a few days the Germans gave us corn bread, less than 150 grams, always moldy and undercooked.”

Since the kitchen was located about one kilometer from the “Gypsy pavilion”, the food was brought to them only once a day, at 2 p.m. Hunger was omnipresent. Unlike Jewish children, the Belgrade Municipality. I later heard that it became much worse. In the morning – a cup of warm water which the Germans called coffee and which we had to wait for in line for hours. For lunch – a ⅛ liter of mostly cabbage, usually rotten and cooked in suet. We were supposed to get supper, as well, but due to a lack of caldrons, a part of the inmates got lunch and the others got supper. There were only three or four instances when I received both lunch and supper on the same day. In the beginning, we were given bread but after a few days the Germans gave us corn bread, less than 150 grams, always moldy and undercooked.

The food was handed out by Jewish and Roma capos armed with sticks in order to contain the famished people. The inmates were allowed to move around the camp during daytime, until 8 p.m. The beds, so-called “boxes”, were covered with straw which rotted and became a nest of infection because of parasites. Since there was no separate administration for Roma, one of the imprisoned women from the Jewish administration was selected to take care of the “Gypsy camp.”

The food was handed out by Jewish and Roma capos armed with sticks in order to contain the famished people. The inmates were allowed to move around the camp during daytime, until 8 p.m. The beds, so-called “boxes”, were covered with straw which rotted and became a nest of infection because of parasites. Despite the prisoners’ exhaustion, they were often forced to perform labor consisting of piling up soil and gravel at the camp. There were no windows at the pavilions and the walls and rooftops were damaged by the bombings, constantly letting in rain and snow. There were furnaces, but almost no fuel. Besides, it was not possible to heat the pavilions in such a damaged condition.

A statement by Charlotte Ćosić before the State Commission for Investigating Crimes of the Occupying Forces and their Helpers on June 19, 1947:

“Pavilion No. 5 held Jewish women brought from the provincial areas; there were particularly many from Šabac. There could have been up to 2000 souls at this pavilion. Other than that, one pavilion – I do Kako nisu imali svoju posebnu upravu, jedna zarožljivica iz jevrejske uprave logora je odredena da se stara o „Ciganskom logoru.”

Većina Roma iz Beograda je imala stalno mesto boravišta, ali opštine nisu htele da garantuju za njih, tako da je veliki broj Roma iz tog razloga doveden na Sajmište, kao češi. U logoru su bile žene sa dekom, dok su deca preko četnog meseca godina starosti bili odvođeni u logor na Banjici.

Uslovi života u romskom delu logora su bili mnogo teži nego u jevrejskom. Izjava Šarlote Rot, državnog komisara za utvrđivanje zločina okupatora i njihovih pomagača 19.06.1947.g.:

“Hrana je bila veoma loša. Za vreme dok sam se nalazila na Sajmištu, tj. decembra meseca i početkom januara – hrana je bila loša beogradska opština. Kasnije sam užila da je još bilo mnogo gore. Izuzeta – izuzet – tople vode koju su Nerci nazivali kafom i za koju su samima morali čekati na red. Za ručak oko četvrt litre, najčešće kupusa, obično trulog i kevanoj na lojo. Trebali smo primati i večeru, ali zbog nedostatka dovoljnih broja kahana, bilo je uređeno tako da jedan deo prima ručak, a drugi večeru, samo tri-četiri puta mi se desilo da sam primila i ručak i večeru istog dana. S početka smo primlali i bile, ali već posle nekoliko dana, Nerci su nam izdavali po najviše do 150 gr, po pravilu buduće i nepočetne.”

Pošto je kuhinja bila udaljena od „ciganskog paviljona” oko jedan kilometar, hrana im je donošena, i to samo jednom u toku dana u dva sata posle podne. Glad je bila stalno prisutna. Romski deca čak nisu dobijala ni mleko u prahu, koje je inače davanje jevrejske deci. Obrok se najčešće sastojao od retke corbe od krompira ili kupusa i od oko 100 gr proje ili hleba.

not remember its number — was populated by Gipsy women who lived in even worse conditions."

Besides the terrible living conditions, life was made even harder for the prisoners by means of daily torture, such as standing in line for several hours in the cold to "air the pavilions", as well as brutalization by the German guards, daily beatings and other forms of torture.\textsuperscript{73}

"The mornings were particularly rough as the Germans ordered us to stand outside for two hours for the pavilion to air, which was just another form of torture they invented, because the pavilion was airing all day and all night since there were no windows and the walls and rooftop were damaged from the bombing, letting in not only clean air but also snow and rain. The concrete in the pavilion was full of puddles or ice, depending on the weather conditions."\textsuperscript{74}

Due to such conditions, the mortality of Roma was high. A report by the acting Representative of the Jewish community to the Belgrade Municipality's Statistics Department proves that 56 Roma had died at the Jewish camp in the period between December 1941 and April 1942.\textsuperscript{75} According to this, the mortality of Roma was around 10%. However, it is assumed that it was much higher, since numerous testimonies confirm that more than five persons had died every day.

"During the day and at night, children were dying, 5 or 6 women, sometimes one or two and sometimes ten. In the morning, they were dying, a family member; then they reported it, a nurse came and pronounced death and the body was taken away."

The bodies were mostly buried near the Sava River, as testified by Stevan Kostić to the Historical Archives of Belgrade on June 25 1986:\textsuperscript{76}

"There was a lime pit towards the Sava River, outside the fence; there was a gate so that people would not wander around; there were no guards there. This was the gate through which we carried the dead and threw them into the lime pit. One of the prisoners was in charge of covering the bodies with lime. The lime pit was huge."

The bodies were also transported to Belgrade where they were buried at different locations.

"One afternoon during the winter of 1941-1942 – I do not remember the precise day or month – I saw Jesus (I recognized them by the ribbons they wore on their arms) carrying corpses wrapped in white sheets on stretchers over the frozen Sava River from the Sajmište camp to the Belgrade side of the river. Then I saw a big lorry at the Belgrade bank, already containing corpses, also wrapped in white sheets."

This is a statement by Radisav Pavlović before the State Commission for Investigating Crimes of the Occupying Forces and their Helpers from April 28 1947.\textsuperscript{77}

In January 1942, Roma inmates were released from the camp based on appeals which were accepted only if written by prisoners' relatives and valid until March 1 1942.\textsuperscript{78} Those without appeals, Pored očajnih uslova života još više je logorašima otežavano svakodnevnim torturama, kao što je stajanje u stroju nekoliko sati po hladnom vremenu da bi se "vetrili paviljoni", zatim iživljavanje nemačkih čuvara nad njima, svakodnevna batinjanja i druga mučenja.\textsuperscript{79}

"Naročito je težko bilo jutro kada smo po naredbenju Nemaca morali da se paviljon vetri, što je bio samo jedan oblik mučenja koji su izmisli Nemi, jer se paviljon vetrio cene dan i cene noć jer, ništa je bilo prozorova, a i zidovi i krov su bili tako oštećeni od bombardovanja da je stalno vuzalo i tađ vazduh, nege i sneg i kopa, tako da je beton u paviljonu bio pun bara ili leda, već prema vremenu."\textsuperscript{80}

Usled ovakvih uslova bila je velika smrtnost među Romima. Sačuvan je izveštaj v.đ. Predstavnika jevrejske zajednice upućen Gradskom poglavarstvu grada Beograda, Statističkom odseku, u kojem se vidi da je u periodu od decembra 1941. do aprila 1942. u jevrejskom logoru Zemun umrlo pedeset i petnaest Roma.\textsuperscript{81} Iz ovoga proizlazi da je smrtnost Roma bila oko 10%. Međutim, pretpostavlja se da je ona bila znatno viša, jer prema brojnim svedočenjima dnevno je umiralo preko pet osoba.

"Preko dana, po noći, umiru dece, žene po 5–6, neki put jedno, dvoje, neki put deset. Ujutru se čuju da kukaju, neko od familije, onda jav, sestra dođe, utvrdi smrt i onda se nosi."

Uglavnom su ih sahranjivali pored Save, o čemu svedoči izjava Kostić Stevana data Istorijском Arhivu Beograda 25.06.1986.\textsuperscript{82}

"Prema Savu je bila krećana, van ograde, tu je bila jedna kapija da ne bi ili okolo, tu nije bilo straže, i na tu kapiju smo izvozili one koji su umrli i baciši ih u tu krećanu. Jedan od savršenika je bio zadužen da te umire postapa sa krećom. Krećana je bila ugrožena."

Takođe, leševi su bili prenoeni i u Beograd, gde su sahranjivani na različitim mestima.

"Jedno popodne u zimu 1941–1942. dana i meseca se ne sećam tačno, video sam jevreje (poznao sam ih po traci koju su nosili preko ruku) kako na nositima prenose leševi koji su bili uvezeni u beo šarav, preko zaledene Save, sa logora na Sajmištu, na drugu-beogradsku stranu Save. Video sam dalje da je na beogradskoj obali stajao veliki kamin u koji su već bili uvezeni leševi isto tako uvezeni i belo platno."

Ovo je izjava Pavlović Radisava data Državnoj komisiji za ispitivanje zločina okupatora i njihovih pomagača 28.04.1947.\textsuperscript{83}

U januaru 1942. počelo je puštanje Roma iz logora na osnovu molbi koje su se prihvatale samo ako su ih napisali rođaci zatočenih. Ove molbe su važile do prvog marta 1942.\textsuperscript{84} Oni Romi za koje

---

\textsuperscript{73} Historical Archives of Belgrade, memories of Stefan Kostić.
\textsuperscript{74} Historical Archives of Belgrade, memories of Stefan Kostić.
\textsuperscript{75} Jewish Historical Museum, k.24-2-2/12.
\textsuperscript{76} Historical Archives of Belgrade, memories of Pavle Dekić.
\textsuperscript{77} Historical Archives of Belgrade, memories of Pavle Dekić.
\textsuperscript{78} Milan Koljanin, Nemacki logor na beogradskom Sajmištu 1941–1944, Belgrade, 146.
\textsuperscript{79} Lazar Ivanović, Mladen Vukomanović, Dani crvena na Sajmištu. Logor na Sajmištu 1941–1944, Novi Sad, 1969, 74.
\textsuperscript{80} IAB, sećanje Pavla i Milorada Dekića i Stevana Kostića.
\textsuperscript{81} JIM, k.24-2-2-8.
\textsuperscript{82} Arhiv Vojnoistorijskog Instituta (AVII), Nedićev fond, f.36, f.1.
\textsuperscript{83} IAB, sećanje Stevana Kostića.
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\textsuperscript{85} JIM, k.24-2-2/12.
\textsuperscript{86} IAB, sećanje Pavla Dekića.
as well as Travellers, were murdered along with the Jews during the April 1943 “cleansing” of the camp.80

In May, the camp was given a new name and new purpose. It became Anhaltslager Semlin – a detention camp for imprisoned communists who were then sent to forced labor in Norway.81

Unfortunately, the Germans burned the camp archive so it is not possible to determine the exact number of persons who were murdered or had died.82

... In our country, the State Commission for Investigating Crimes of the Occupying Forces and their Helpers was founded by AVNOJ on November 30, 1943. Regional committees to investigate crimes were established in Slovenia, Montenegro, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Macedonia, Serbia and Croatia, as well as in the province of Vojvodina. The committees carried out research to determine the number of victims. However, while there is specific data regarding Jews, it does not exist for Roma. The Regional Committee of the People's Republic of Serbia was the only one to elaborate a report on the crimes committed against Roma on the territory of Serbia. The other regional committees failed to name Roma victims in a single document. This even includes the Regional Committee of Croatia, despite the fact that most of Roma were killed on the territory of Croatia, at the Jasenovac camp.

Why are Roma and Jewish victims being treated differently, especially given the fact that German authorities put them on equal footing during the occupation, as those were the only groups persecuted and murdered for racial reasons? Perhaps this indicates a different attitude of the state towards Roma and Jews, respectively.

A different attitude to Jewish and Roma victims, respectively, is not only a characteristic of our country, but all others, as well. This is best shown by comparing compensations to both peoples. Namely, the West German Government took on a commitment in 1952 to pay $845 million to the country, but all others, as well. This is best shown by comparing compensations to both peoples. Towards Roma and Jews, respectively.

Postavlja se pitanje zašto se drugačije tretiraju romske i jevrejske žrtve, jer nemačke vlasti su za vreme okupacije izjednačile Jevreje i Roma, i jedino su njih proganjali i ubijali iz rasnih razloga. Možda to pokazuje drugačiji odnos države prema Romima i prema Jevrejima.

Pravljenje razlike između jevrejskih i romskih žrtava nije karakteristično samo za našu zemlju, već i za sve ostale. To se najbolje vidi kada se uporede obeštećenja data pripadnicima jednog i drugog naroda. Naime, 1952. vlada zapadne Nemačke se obaveza da će državi Izrael isplatiti 945 miliona dolara u roku od dvanaest godina na ime obeštećenja jevrejskom narodu.83 1978. je osnovan fond u zapadnoj Nemačkoj, iz kojeg je isplaćeno 85 milijardi maraka jevrejskim žrtvama Holocausta.84 Treba pomenuti i fond od 200 miliona maraka, koji je, takođe, osnovala vlada Nemačke 1998. samo za jevrejske žrtve. Obeštećenja data Romima, kao što se moglo videti u predgovoru ovog rada, u odnosu na obeštećenja data Jevrejima, više su nego ponižavajuća. Ovo upoređivanje nema za cilj da izvaga koji od ova dva naroda je više stradao, već da podseti da su svi ljudi jednaki (barem formalno), i da svaka žrtva ratnog zločina mora biti priznata kao takva i da shodno tome mora imati isti tretman.

77 IAB, sećanje Pavla Dekića.
78 Milan Kuličin, n.d., 146.
81 Ibid.
82 Documents of the State Commission for Investigating Crimes of the Occupying Forces and their Helpers are kept in the Archives of Yugoslavia
83 Reparations and Restitutions, Simon Wiesenthal Center, 1997.
84 Ibid.
Conclusion

The late 18th century Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen, embodied in most European states’ constitutions, defines human rights as “unalienable”, which means that a human being is their source and their goal and that they are independent of any government and authority. World War II has proven that this was impossible to realize, because when human beings do not have their own government or state, no one can protect them nor is any institution willing to do so. This is only confirmed by the plight of Roma and Jews: two peoples without their own respective states were condemned to death by the “Final Solution.”

The hostility toward the Roma people in Serbia – which can be called racism without concerns that this word could sound too harsh – was always there and still exists. It was not the Germans who introduced racism in Serbia during the occupation; it had smoldered and culminated at that point. Ljotić and the quisling authorities were not the only supporters of this ideology – it was also massively backed by the people. How else can one explain the utter indifference and lack of interest about Roma victims? Besides, how can one explain the fact that when Roma were taken to camps, their houses and property were robbed by their Serbian neighbors?

As seen in this text, Roma were taken to camps mainly because their municipalities were unwilling to guarantee for them after the German authorities ordered the arrest of Travellers rather than Roma with permanent residence. This means that the local Serbian authorities were much more zealous in enforcing German orders than it was expected from them. German measures against Jews and Roma in Serbia may not have caused public rapture, as was the case in Poland, but one cannot deny a level of responsibility of the common people who quietly accepted it.

In his lectures on the spiritual situation in Germany, held during the 1945-1946 winter semester in Heidelberg, Karl Jaspers tackled this very issue – the common people’s guilt. According to Jaspers, there are four categories of guilt: 1. criminal responsibility; crimes are acts unequivocally violating the law and can be objectively proven. In this case, the jurisdiction rests with the court; 2. political guilt; it is a result of actions by a country’s officials and citizens. Every person bears partial responsibility for his/her government; 3. moral guilt; an individual bears moral responsibility for all his/her actions, including the execution of political and military decisions, because crimes remain crimes even if they were ordered; 4. metaphysical guilt; in this case it is necessary to stress that there is solidarity among people as members of the human race, rendering everyone co-responsible for every injustice in the world and especially for crimes committed in his/her presence or with his/her knowledge.

According to this categorization, the quisling authorities in Serbia can be considered guilty when it comes to all four categories of responsibility and guilt. This, of course, cannot be said for the common people, since they did not directly perform crimes nor were they responsible for actions by their officials, as the government was not elected but rather imposed by German authorities. However, we can discuss the metaphysical guilt of every individual from the standpoint of humanity.

Today, metaphysical guilt can also be discussed in terms of responsibility of those who oppose writing and talking about the suffering of Roma in World War II. Another important issue is the lack of studies on their suffering in Yugoslavia and the fact that no statements were taken from Roma who witnessed the crimes.

Zaključak

Deklaracija prava čoveka i građanina s kraja osamnaestog veka, koja je ušla u većinu ustava evropskih država, definisala je ljudska prava kao „neotuđiva“, što znači da je čovek njihov izvor i njihov cilj, i da su ona nezavisna od svih vlada i vlasti. Drugi svetski rat je pokazao da je to nemoguće ostvariti, jer kada ljudska bića nemaju svoju vladu, državu, ne može ih nikako značiti niti je ijeđa institucija voljna to da učini. Ono što se desilo Romima i Jevrejima je potvrda toa jer kao dva naroda koja nisu imali svoju državu, bili su osuđeni na smrt u „konačnom rešenju.“

Neprijateljstvo prema romskom narodu u Srbiji, koje se može nazvati rasizmom, odovek je postojalo i još već postoji. Nisu Nemci za vreme okupacije uveli rasizam u Srbiju, on je tinjao i tada je doživeo kulminaciju. Nisu samo Ljotić i krvavštine vlasti bile pristalice ove ideologije, masa naroda je podržala jer kako ipak objašnjava potpunu ravnodušnost i nezainteresovanost za romske žrtve. Sem toga, kako objasnitи činjenicu kada su Romi odvedeni u logore, da su njihove kuće i imovinu opljačkali Srbı, njihovi susjed?

Kao što se moglo videti u prethodnom delu teksta, Romi su odvedeni u logore uglavnom zato što opštine nisu htela da garantuju za njih, jer nemačke vlasti su propisale da samo Romi-čergari budu uhapšeni, a ne stalno naseljeni Romi. Znači da se može reći da su lokalne, domaće vlasti bile mnogo revnosnije u sprovođenju nemačkih naredbi, nego što se to od njih tražilo. Možda u Srbiji, nemačke mere protiv Jevreja i Roma nisu izazvali oduševljenje naroda, kao u Poljskoj, ali ne može se negirati izvesna odgovornost običnih ljudi koji su čutke sve to prihvatili.


Po ovoj podeli, može se reći da su u Srbiji krvavštine vlasti krive u pogledu sva četiri pojma odgovornosti i krivice. Za običan narod se to, naravno, ne može reći, jer nisu obični ljudi direktno vršili zločine, niti su bili odgovorni za postupke svojih zvaničnika jer ih nisu oni izabrali, već ih je nemačka vlast nametla. Ali zato se može govoriti o metafizičkoj krivici svakog pojedinca sa stanovišta ljudskosti.

O metafizičkoj krivici se može govoriti i danas, u smislu odgovornosti ljudi koji ne žele da se o stradanjima Roma u Drugom svetskom ratu, govori i piše. Vršena je važna pitanje zašto do danas ni jedan istraživač nije uradio istraživanje o romskom stradanju u Jugoslaviji, i zašto nisu uspele izjave od Roma, svedoka zločina.
Being a minority, Roma never sought territorial autonomy – separation was never their goal. They only want to preserve their identity and be different, which is a fundamental human right. In order to achieve this, it is necessary that the state commits to combat racial violence. That is the only way to enable every society with a healthy development; especially our society which, following the national wars in the 1990s, has to struggle with national exclusion and intolerance towards anyone and anything “different”. Also, that is the only way to prevent the repeating of events from World War II.

This text gives only a partial answer to many questions related to this subject. I hope that there will be some effort to provide those answers in our country, too, and that the work will not remain only in the hands of Roma associations.
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INTRODUCTION

The Belgrade Old Fairground complex is located between Branko Bridge and the Old Railway Bridge, across from the Sava Amphitheater. At first it was a highly prized architectural-urban complex, the first modern urban complex on the left side of the Sava River, during the Second World War a place of mass torture (first a Judenlager Semlin and then Anhaltslager Semlin), damaged and destroyed to a great degree during the allied bombing in April 1944, headquarters of the Novi Beograd Construction Directorate until 1950, a fine artists colony till 1951, and today it has been forgotten and left to spontaneous urban development.

“Old Fairground – Gestapo Concentration Camp” has been declared a cultural heritage by decision of the Belgrade City Assembly in July 1987. While the decision was being prepared to declare it a cultural heritage the complex was valorized by defining its importance: as a concentration camp – a place of execution, as a place intended for the improvement of trade and industry in Serbia, as the first urbanized space on the left bank of the Sava River, as a architectural-urban accomplishment, and also as a place which has importance in the artistic life of Belgrade. The concentration camp period was deemed most important and as the main goal of the reconstruction of this space it was decided to mark the memories of these events.

In 1992 the City Assembly of Belgrade adopted a 'Detailed Urban Plan' of the Memorial Complex of the Old Fairground. Today the place has the appearance of a city slum due to the deterioration of all and individual structures, inadequate equipment and due to the ways in which the complex is used. The complex’s central position on the Sava River, in close proximity to what is expected to be the new city center, indicates that there is a threat of uncontrolled urban growth on its premises.

EINLEITUNG


Durch Beschluss des Belgrader Stadtparlaments wurde das “Gestapolager Staro Sajmište” (dt. altes Messegelände) 1987 zum Kulturgut erklärt. Im Laufe der Vorbereitungen zur Ernennung dieses Gebietes zum Kulturgut wurde eine Bewertung des Komplexes vorgenommen, in deren Rahmen seine Bedeutung als Lager-/Hinrichtungsort, als erste urbanisierte Fläche am linken Save-Ufer, als architektonisch-urbanistische Errungenschaft sowie sein Beitrag zur Förderung von Handel und Wirtschaft in Serbien und seine Bedeutung für die Kunstszene in Belgrad festgehalten wurde. Die Zeitspanne, als das Messegelände als Lager fungierte, wurde als die signifikanteste eingestuft, sodass die Wahrung der Erinnerung an besagte Ereignisse zum Hauptziel der Rekonstruktion dieses Raumes erklärt wurde.


УВОД

Комплекс Старог Београдског сајмишта се налази на простору између Бранковог и Старог железничког моста, преко пута савског амфитеатра. Прво архитектонско-урбанистичке високе домета, први савремени урбани комплекс на левој обали Саве, током Другог светског рата најмањије мучиниште (најпре Judenlager Semlin, а потом Anhaltslager Semlin), оштећен и у великој мери срушен током савезничког бомбардовања априла 1944, седиште Дирекције за изградњу Новог Београда до 1950, саведеште ликовних уметника од 1951, данас је заборављен и препуштен спонтаном урбаном развоју.


Данашња запуштеност целине и свих појединачних објеката, неодговарајућа опрема и начин коришћења комплекса чине да он има карактер градског слама. Централна позиција на обали Саве, непосредно до очекиваног новог центра града, указује на опасност од неконтролисаног урбаног раста на овом простору.
PHYSICAL STRUCTURE AND APPLICATION IN 1937
PHYSIKALISCHE STRUKTUR UND VERWENDUNG IM JAHR 1937
ФИЗИЧКА СТРУКТУРА И НАМЕНА ИЗ 1937. ГОДИНЕ

1. Central Tower - Exhibition pavilion / Zentraler Turm - Ausstellungspavillon / Централна Кула - Изложбени павиљон
2. Administrative Building / Verwaltungsgebäude / Управна Зграда
3. Spasić pavilion / Spasić Ausstellungspavillon / Спасићев Изложбени павиљон
4. Italian Exhibition Hall / Italienischer Ausstellungspavillon / Италиански Изложбени павиљон
5. Czechoslovakian Exhibition Hall / Tschechoslowakischer Ausstellungspavillon / Чешко-Словачки Изложбени павиљон
6. Hungarian Exhibition Hall / Ungarischer Ausstellungspavillon / Мађарски Изложбени павиљон
7. Private Exhibition Hall Stefanović / Privater Stefanović Ausstellungspavillon / Павиљон Стефановић - приватни изложбени павиљон
8.-12. Yugoslav Exhibition Halls / Jugoslawische Ausstellungspavillons / Југословенски Изложбени павиљони
9. Romanian Exhibition Hall / Rumänischer Ausstellungspavillon / Румунски Изложбени павиљон
10. Exhibition Hall for Fishing Equipment / Ausstellungspavillon Fischereibedarf / Рибарски Изложбени павиљон
11. Exhibition Hall Philips Company / Ausstellungspavillon der Firma Philips / Филипсов Изложбени павиљон
12. Open Hall / Offene Halle / Отворени Трем
13. Electric Station / Elektrische Zentrale / Трафо Станци
14. Entrance Gate / Eingangstor / Улазни капија
15. Private Exhibition Halls / Private Ausstellungspavillons / Приватни Изложбени павиљони

Objects preserved until today / Bis heute erhaltene Objekte / Објекти који су сачувани до данас
Destroyed objects / Zerstörte Objekte / Порушени Објекти
1. Historical Development

1.1. The First Belgrade Fair
   September 1937 – 1941

The idea to build the first Belgrade Fair developed just before the First World War and was initiated by Belgrade merchants. By the middle of the fourth decade of the last century this important industrial complex came to realization with the financial backing of the Belgrade Municipalities, banks, industrial organizations, merchants and industrialists and the Nikola Spasic Endowment.

The first Belgrade Fair had been constructed from September 1936 to April 1937, on the left bank of the Sava River and next to the Aleksandar I bridge. Project development was entrusted to three architects of the Technical Head Office of the Belgrade Municipalities: Milivoj Tricković, Djordje Lukić and Rajko Tatić, who developed the fair’s urban plan and made projects for five fair pavilions with a central tower (40 meters in height) located in the middle of the complex; thus creating the first urbanized space on the space of today’s Novi Beograd. Monitoring of the construction was done by architect Aleksandar Sekulić, the Director of the Technical Department of the Society for Fair Events and Exhibits, creator of the central tower and the Endowment of Nikola Spasic pavilion.

The exhibit pavilions were of various sizes – taking into consideration what purpose they were to serve and the nature of what was to be exhibited. Pavilion number three, located south of the tower, was the largest pavilion on the Fair. It covered 3000 square meters in space and was intended exclusively for exhibiting industrial objects. The first and second pavilions, spanning 2100 square meters, faced one another and located east of the tower, in the urban solution developed for the Fair, forming a symmetrical front toward the river. The fourth and fifth pavilions, spanning 1600 square meters, set west of the central tower, were intended to match the first and second. The architecture of the five big pavilions had all the hallmarks of modern architecture. In accordance with each other when it came to style and symmetrically located around the central square with the tower in the middle, they all fitted harmoniously in the special solution and as such gave Belgrade’s first Fairground a symmetrical and unique appearance. The spacious square in the middle and the airy communication gave the complex a clear overview and made it functional. The central

1. ИСТОРИЈСКИ РАЗВОЈ

1.1. Први београдски сајам
   септембар 1937. – 1941. година

Идеја о изгрању Првог београдског сајма јавила се пред сам почетак Првог светског рата на иницијативу београдских трговаца. Уз материјалну подршку Београдске општине, банака, привредних организација, трговаца и индустријалаца, Задужбине Николе Спасић, средином четврте деценије прошлог века дошло је до реализације овог значајног привредног комплекса.

Први београдски сајам podignut је у периоду од септембра 1936. до априла 1937. године на левој обали Саве поред моста краља Александра I. Израда пројекта поверена је тројици архитекта: Миловој Триковићу, Ђорђу Лукићу и Рајку Татићу, који су израдили урбанистички план Сајмашта и дали пројекте за пет сајамских павиљона са централном кулом висине 40 m у средишту комплекса створивши тако први урбанизован простор на терену данашњег Новог Београда. Надзор над градњом вршио је архитекта Александар Секулић, директор Техничког одсека Друштва за приређивање сајмова и изложби, аутор централне куле и павиљона Задужбине Николе Спасић.

Изложбени павиљони били су различитих величина, с обзиром на одговарајуће намене и природу експоната. Павиљон број три, смештен јужно од куле, био је највећи сајамски павиљон. Покривао је површину од 5000 m², а служио је искључиво за излагање индустријских објеката. Павиљон број четири и пет, површине 2100 m², постављени са један наставак другог источно од куле, у урбанистичком решењу сајмашта образовали су симетричан фронт према реци. Четврти и пети павиљон, површине 1600m², подигнути западно од централне куле, били су пандан данас првом и другом. Архитектурата пет великих павиљона имала је све одлике модерне архитектуре. Стилска угашеност и симетрично распоређени око централног трга са кулом у средишту хармонично су се уклопили у просторно решење и тиме Првом београдском сајму дали складан и јединствен изглед. Простран трг у средишту и зракасте комуникације учинили су компликацитет прецизним и функционалним. Централни објекат у виду куле имао је двоструку улогу: служио је као изложбени павиљон
From 1938 till 1940 a great number of medium and small buildings for domestic companies were constructed and the number of foreign investors grew. Turkey erected its pavilion in 1938, and Germany followed one year later. The construction of the Sixth Yugoslavian pavilion, based on architect Aleksandar Sekulic project, started in 1940. Unfortunately, war stopped all further expansion of this important industrial complex which later became a concentration camp.

From December 8th 1941 to beginning of May 1942 the German military governance had established this camp in cooperation with the newly formed Independent State of Croatia. In this camp were interned, the postwar remains of the Jews andGermans. Among the Jews around 600 Roma.

The first Belgrade fall fair opened on September 11th, 1937, and the ceremony was held in the Endowment of Nikola Spasic pavilion. All the time through 1941 spring and fall exhibits were held for all branches of industry, as well as exhibits of special character (cars, aeronautics, crafts), book fairs, sports manifestations, art exhibits, concerts, congresses, and the first TV program on the Balkans was broadcast.

1.2. Jewish Concentration Camp Zemun – Judenlager Semlin December 1941 – May 1942

From December 8th 1941 to beginning of May 1942 the concentration camp on Belgrade’s Fairground held the name of Jewish Concentration Camp Zemun (Judenlager Semlin). The German military governance had established this camp in cooperation with the newly formed Independent State of Croatia. In it all the remaining Jews from occupied Serbia were interned – around 7000 of them. Alongside with the Jews around 600 Roma people were interned in a separate pavilion – they were released by April of 1942. Both groups of detainees consisted mostly of people from the town of Zemun.

1.2. Judenlager Semlin Dezember 1941 – Mai 1942


1.2. Јеврејски логор Земун – Judenlager Semlin децембар 1941. - мај 1942. године

Логор на Београдском сајмишту од 8. децембра 1941. године, до поплета маја 1942. године носио је име Јеврејски логор Земун (Judenlager Semlin). Немачка војна управа је у сарадњи са тим формираном НДХ формирала овај логор. У њему су интерниране све превазилазе јеврејски број персоналије из оккупираних Србије, њих око 7.000. Заједно са Јеврејима у овој логору интернирано је и око 600 Рома, који су до поплета априла 1942. године пуштени. Обе групе заточника угледном су биле састављене од жена, деце и старијих особа. Постојећи окружен зрачано призиданим анексима и у исто време био негативни централни мотив видљив са најудаљенијих тачака града. Истовремено са изградњом павиљона подигнут је састављен зграда сајму, ресторан, билетарнице, изграђени су путеви, засађени дрвореди, уређени паркови. Престао је сајмирспротивне предма утврђеном регулационом плану биле су намењене за иностране и домаће павиљоне. Погинуло је један број индивидуалних павиљона, полуотворени и отворени изложен простори, павиљон Задужбине Николе Спасић, као и павиљони Италије, Чехословачке, Румуније, Мађарске, Падобранска Шкодина кула и павиљон холандске фирме „Филипс".

Први београдски јесени сајам отворен је 11. јуна 1937. године, а свечаност је одржана у павиљону Задужбине Николе Спасић. На сајму су све до 1941. године организоване пролећне и јесене изложбе из свих грана привреде, изложбе специјалног карактера (автомобила, аеронаутике, занатаства), сајмови књига, спортске манифестације, уметничке изложбе, концерти, конгреси, емитован је први телевизијски програм на Балкану.

У периоду од 1938. до 1940. године изграђен је велики број средњих и мањих објеката домаћих фирми, увећао се број странских излагаца. Турска је подигла свој павиљон 1938, а годину дана касније то је учинила и Немачка. Изградња Шестог страних излагаца према проекту архитекте Александара Секулича започета је 1940. Нажалост, ратне прилике су прекинуле даљу експандицију овог значајног привредног комплекса који је претворен у концентрациони логор.
Physical Structure and Application in 1941
Physikalische Struktur und Verwendung im Jahr 1941
Физичка Структура и Намена из 1941. године

1. Central Tower - Jewish Camp Administration / Zentraler Turm - Jüdische Lagerverwaltung / ЦЕНТРАЛНА КУЛА - ЉЕВРЕЈСКА УПРАВА ЛОГОРА
2. Administrative Building - German Camp Administration / Verwaltungsgebäude - Deutsche Lagerverwaltung / УПРАВНА ЗАРАДА - НЕМАЧКА КОМАНДА ЛОГОРА
3. Spašić pavilion - Hospital / Spašić Ausstellungspavillon - Krankenstation / Спасићев Изложбени павиљон - Болница
4. Italian Exhibition Hall - Food storage and joinery/ Italienischer Ausstellungspavillon - Lebensmittel-Lager und Schreinerei / Италиански Изложбени павиљон - МАГАЦИН ХРАНЕ И СТОЛАРСКА РАДИОНИЦА
5. Czechoslovakian Exhibition Hall - Forced labourers' Camp / Tschechoslowakischer Ausstellungspavillon - Arbeitslager / Чешко-Словачки Изложбени павиљон - У ФУНКЦИЈИ ЛОГОРА
6. Hungarian Exhibition Hall - Place for execution of inmates / Ungarischer Ausstellungspavillon - Ort für die Hinrichtung von Häftlingen / Мађарски Изложбени павиљон - ЕГЗЕКУЦИЈА ЛОГОРАША
7. Private Exhibition Hall Stefanović - Forced labourers' Camp / Private Stefanović Ausstellungspavillon - Arbeitslager / Павиљон Стефановић - У ФУНКЦИЈИ ЛОГОРА
8, 9, 10, и 12. Yugoslav Exhibition Halls - Inmates' living space / Jugoslawische Ausstellungspavillons - Häftlingsunterkünfte / Југословенки Изложбени павиљони - СМЕШТАЈ ЛОГОРАША
11. Camp kitchen / Lagerküche / ЛОГОРСКА КУХИЊА
13. Romanian Exhibition Hall - Storage Jewish objects of value / Rumanischer Ausstellungspavillon - Sammelstelle für jüdisches Wertgegenstände / Румунски Изложбени павиљон - МАГАЦИН ЉЕВРЕЈСКИХ СТАВРИ
14. Exhibition Hall for Fishing Equipment - Place for execution of inmates / Fischerei-Pavillon Fischereibedarf - Ort für die Hinrichtung von Häftlingen / Рибарски павиљон - ЕГЗЕКУЦИЈА ЛОГОРАША
16. Turkish pavilion - Bath and morgue / Türkischer Pavillon - Bad und Leichenhalle / ТУРСКИ ПАВИЉОН - КУПАТИЛО Ј МРТВАЧНИЦА
17. German pavilion - Forced labourers' Camp / Deutscher Pavillon - Arbeitslager / НЕМАЧКИ ПАВИЉОН - У ФУНКЦИЈИ ЛОГОРА
18. Entrance Gate / Eingangstor / Улазне Капије
women, children and elders. The existing pavilions were adapted to the needs of the concentration camp, and the whole complex was surrounded by barbed wire and secured by guard posts. In the biggest pavilion, number 3, which measures 5000 square meters, the dividing walls were knocked down, and 5000 people were placed there in unbearable conditions. The remainder of pavilions was used for other purposes of the concentration camp: the Turkish one for the baths, the Romanian one as storage for Jewish belongings, the Hungarian one for torture and hangings of prisoners, the Fisher-man’s pavilion for firing squad executions. The camp’s hospital was placed in Spasic’s pavilion.

During the long and cold winter of 1941 – 1942 many detainees died of hunger, cold, illness and inhumane treatment of the camp’s German directorate. Those who survived that winter would face a horrible death in the special truck-gas chamber. Jewish women, children and elders were killed every day on route to the camp to mass graves, prepared in advance, in the village of Jajinci. Between March and May 1942 all Jewish prisoners of the Fairground Concentration Camp – around 6 280 women and children – were killed by carbon-monoxide poisonin Once the gas-truck had finished its deadly mission and was returned to Berlin and Serbia was declared “Judenfrei” – “cleared of Jews”.

The Belgrade Fairground concentration camp was a place of total extermination of the Jewish people, where over seven thousand Jews died in only five months.

1.3. Transitory Camp Zemun – Anhaltelager Semlin

May 1942 – July 1944

In the spring of 1942, when the execution of Jews had reached its end, the first groups of captured partisans and chetniks, as well as civilians captured in areas where fighting took place, were brought in to the Belgrade Fairground concentration camp. The camp’s name was also changed to “Transitory Camp Zemun”, which did not mean there was a change in the camp’s cruel treatment of detainees. There was an especially large influx of detainees after the great German-Croatian offensive in Bosnia, on the territories of Kozara Mountain in the summer of 1942. The prisoners were placed in the fifth pavilion, which was surrounded by barbed wire. Beide Gruppen von Gefangenen bestanden mehrheitlich aus Frauen, Kindern und älteren Personen. Die vorhandenen Pavillons wurden ihnen neuen Zweck als Lager angepasst und der ganze Komplex mit Stacheldraht und Wachposten gesichert. Die Trennwände im mit 5000 m² Fläche größten Pavillon Nr. 3 wurde abgerissen, sodass dort bis zu 5.000 Menschen unter unerträglichen Bedingungen untergebracht wurden. Die restlichen Pavillons wurden zu unterschiedlichen Funktionen im Lager angepasst: Der Türkische Pavillon wurde zum Bad, der Rumänische zum Magazin für jüdisches Eigentum, im Ungarischen Pavillon wurden die Gefangenen gefoltert und gehängt, der Fischerpavillon diente als Hinrichtungsstätte. Spasić-Pavillon wurde zum lagereigenen Lazarett.


Das Lager am Belgrader Messegelände stellt einen Ort der absoluten Auslöschung des jüdischen Volkes dar, wo innerhalb von nur fünf Minuten über 7000 Juden ihr Leben verloren.

1.3. Anhaltelager Semlin

May 1942 – July 1944

Im Frühjahr 1942, als das Martyrium des jüdischen Volkes abschlossen war, wurde die erste Gruppe von Kämpfern (Partisanen wie auch Tscheniks) und Zivilisten, welche in Kriegsgefangenenlagern gefasst worden waren, ins Lager am Belgrad-Messegelände gebracht. Zwar wurde der Name des Lagers zu „Anhaltelager Semlin“ geändert, aber das Prinzip der Auslöschung des jüdischen Volkes blieb unverändert. Der Name des Lagers, das zu „Anhaltelager Semlin“ geändert wurde, hatte nicht nur fachlichen, sondern auch politischen Hintergrund. 

In der Nähe des Geländes standen ebenfalls Lager für andere Nationalitäten. Die Lager waren in der Regel einseitig angelegt und hatten keine Überdachungen."
From the camp the detainees were transferred to Germany, Austria and Norway or to mines in Serbia as forced labor, if they survived the camp's hard conditions. Executions of prisoners never stopped – in the camp itself as well as in the areas surrounding Belgrade. Illness, hunger, exhaustion and continuous torture also take an astounding number of victims. Corpses were transported and buried in the late evening hours on the Zemun cemetery. The newest research, though not definite, indicate that 32000 people passed through the transitory camp on the fairground, out of which 11000 died mostly of illness, exhaustion or as a consequence of beatings.

The camp was severely damaged during the allied bombing in April 1944, and three months later that same year it was deactivated.

The Belgrade Old Fairground concentration camp was the largest German concentration camp not only in occupied Serbia but also in the European South-East, and as such it is an unforgettable symbol of this tragic period in our history.

1.4. Old Fairground – The Place Where the Building of Novi Beograd Begins October 1947 – 1950

The camp's function and purpose significantly change with the establishment of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia – the space occupied by the camp and later the concentration camp become part of the future new city.

In October of 1947 youth work brigades, engaged in building the first structures in Novi Beograd (New Belgrade), take residence in the old fairground; they do preparatory work on building of the Belgrade – Zemun road, the residential neighborhood of Tošin Bunar and the Student's City. Hence, in the period from 1947 to 1950 this space indirectly became a center of construction of the new city on the left bank of the Sava River, which had connected two historic core points of the Yugoslav capital. The terrain was modified to fit the new purpose, the damaged fairground pavilions, which could not be salvaged or reconstructed, were knocked down, five Yugoslav pavilions were removed, and so welcher durch Stacheldraht von den wenigen verbliebenen Juden abgesondert wurde.


Die Einrichtung des Lagers wurde in den Luftangriffen der Allierten 1944 stark beschädigt, sodass es im selben Jahr, drei Monate später, außergewöhnlich wurde. Das Lager am alten Belgrader Messegelände war nicht nur das größte deutsche Lager im besetzten Serbien, sondern in ganz Südosteuropa und stellt als solches ein nicht zu vergessendes Symbol dieses tragischen Abschnitts in unserer Geschichte dar.


Mit der Entstehung der Föderativen Volksrepublik Jugoslawien (FVRJ) wird das Gebiet, auf welchem sich das Messegelände und später das Lager befanden, zum integralen Teil einer zu errichtenden, neuen Stadt, womit sich Zweck und Funktion des Raumes wesentlich ändern.

Im Oktober 1947 ziehen Jugendbrigaden ins alte Messegelände ein und beginnen mit dem Bau der ersten Objekte in Neu-Belgrad: Es handelt sich um Vorbereitungsarbeiten für die Straße Belgrad-Zemun, das Haus des Regierungspräsidenten, ein Hotel im staatlichen Eigentum, eine Wohnsiedlung in der Gegend Tošin Bunar und das Studentenwohnheim. So wurde in der Zeit zwischen 1947 und 1950 dieser Raum zum unmittelbaren Mittelpunkt der Errichtung einer neuen Siedlung an linken Save-Ufer, welche die beiden historischen Kerne der jugoslawischen Hauptstadt miteinander verband. Das Gelände wurde seinem neuen Zweck angepasst, die beschädigten Pavillons, die sich nicht

Из лагера были возможность украденной тюремной условностью, упавливающими на присланном к нам, Аустро-Венгрии, норвежским и на раду в уруководе в Србию. Ликвидация затворников произошла благодаря их, как к человеку людского, так и и узниковым близким братьям. Война страдали в немецком лагере не только в освобожденной Сербии, но и в других странах Европы и Северной Африки, где он оказался в качестве военнопленного

Лагер на Старом београдском сајмишту био је јавни немачки лагер, који је постао саставни део будућег новог града, а његова намена и функција била су важна за изградњу новог града.

Октобар 1947. године на Старо сајмиште уселиваче су огледали рад на градишту у такође дано време, где су се саграђувао центар за изградњу новог града, а његова намена и функција била су важна за изградњу новог града.
Temporary housing of youth brigades engaged in construction of Novi Beograd / Vorübergehende Unterkunft für Jugendbrigaden beim Bau von Novi-Beograd / НАМЕНА ПРОСТОРА: ПРИВРЕМЕНИ СМЕШТАЈ ОМЛАДИНСКИХ БРИГАДА НА ИЗГРАДЊИ НОВОГ БЕОГРАДА

1. Head office of Youth Brigade / Generaldirektion der Jugendbrigaden / ГЕНЕРАЛНА ДИРЕКЦИЈА ОМЛАДИНСКИХ БРИГАДА
2. Commission for the Reconstruction of Belgrade / Kommission zum Wiederaufbau von Belgrad / ОДБОР ЗА РЕКОНСТРУКЦИЈУ БГД.
3. Workers housing and Unions’ House / Arbeiterunterkunft und Gewerkschaftshaus / РАДНИЧКИ СТАНОВИ И СИНДИКАЛНИ ДОМ
4. Project office of General Management / Projektbüro der Generaldirektion / ПРОЈЕКТАНТСКИ БИРО ГЕНЕРАЛНЕ ДИРЕКЦИЈЕ
5. Utility Service / Versorgungseinrichtung / КОМУНАЛНА СЛУЖБА
6. Kitchen / Küche / КУХИЊА
7. Exhibition Hall Stefanović / Stefanović Pavillon / ПАВИЉОН СТЕФАНОВИЋ
8. Shops / Läden / ПРОДАВНИЦЕ
9. Transformer / Trafo-Station / ТРАФО СТАНИЦА
10. Food Storage / Lebensmittellager / МАГАЦИН ЗА ХРАНУ
11. Coal storage / Kohlespeicher / МАГАЦИН ЗА УГАЉ
12. Repairing of engines / Maschinenwerkstatt / МЕХ. РАДИОНИЦА
13. Large workshop / Große Werkstatt / ВЕЛИКА РАДИОНИЦА
14. Garage / ГАРАЖЕ
15. Fire brigade / Feuerwehr / ВАТРОГАСНА МИЛИЦИЈА
16. Workers housing / Arbeiterwohnungen / РАДНИЧКИ СТАНОВИ
17. School of workers / Schulke der Arbeiter / РАДНИЧКА ШКОЛА
18. Bath for the workers / Bad für die Arbeiter / РАДНИЧКО КУПАЛИШТЕ
19. Temporary canteen / vorübergehende Kantine / ПРИВРЕМЕНА ТРЕПЕЗАРИЈА
20. Temporary kitchen / vorübergehende Küche / ПРИВРЕМЕНА КУХИЊА
21. Area for Ambulance / Reserviert für die Ambulanz / РЕЗЕРВИСАНО ЗА АМБУЛАНТУ
22. Area for bath and landry / Reserviert für Baden und Waschen / РЕЗЕРВИСАНО ЗА КУПАТИЛО И ПЕРИОНИЦУ
were the Romanian one and the Philips one. In those remaining pavilions, which were adapted to fit the needs of organizing and managing the work brigades, the management i.e. the General Headquarters and the General Directorate for Youth Work Actions was placed. Afterwards, on the foundations of the first two demolished fairground pavilions, four cabins were erected and a one story building intended for lodging of the youth work brigades, while the rest of the space was used to build additional buildings for the needs of the General Directorate for Construction (the Fire-Police Brigade, a garage was built at the place where the fourth pavilion was, workshops, storage spaces), as well as a sports field. The major part of today’s constructions in the old fairground is made up of structures built in that period as well as those from the original fair’s structures. Due to the political and economic crises which resulted from Yugoslavia’s discontinuation of close relations with the Soviet Union and countries of the Warsaw Pact (beginning of 1950) there was also a cessation of plan - ning and development of Novi Beograd. At the end of 1950 when the Studentski Grad pavilion was erected the youth brigades work on Novi Beograd’s development ended, and the Old Fairground yet again got a change of purpose.

1.5 Association of Fine Artists of Serbia
From 1950 till today

When the General Headquarters and Directorate for Youth Work Actions, as well as the youth brigades, were moved out of the old fairgrounds space certain rooms in the pavilions and other buildings were transformed into apartments for the economically disadvantaged, while on Mose Pićade’s initiative and by decision of the Executive People’s Committee – Town Planning Institute, the remainder of the fair’s most important pavilions was given over to the artists of the Association of Fine Artists of Serbia. The inner parts of the tower, the Italian pavilion and other buildings were modified so as to be artist’s studios. Around fifty artists had moved in into the buildings: painters, sculptors, graphics artists. Even though at first this was considered to be a temporary solution, these buildings are to this day being used by many artists. Hence, an artist colony of sorts, where important works of modern Serbian art are being created, had propped up in this space. The following artists have or have had studios in this space:


1.5. Verband der bildenden Künstler Serbiens
1950 bis heute

Milan Besarabic, Zoran Petrovic, Mica Popovic, Vera Bozikovic, Mladen Srbinovic, Olga Jevric, Milos Gvozdenovic, Kosa Boskan, Mario Maskareli, Lazar Vozarevic, Nebojša Mitric and many others. These studios were the place where many post-war ideas were conceived and many works of art were created – which introduced the young painters who came after 1950 to all social roles. Most artists worked as art teachers in the education system, while some, such as Olga Jevric, Mladen Srbinovic and Mica Popovic, became members of the Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts. Aside from the painter's scene other things were taking place as well in the life of the Old Fairground, which was a breeding ground of avant-garde intellectual ideas. For instance, during the late fifties in Mica Popovic's studio the first showing of the drama “Waiting for Godot” took place.

Several generations of artists who had created their works on the Old Fairground space actively participated in all types of painting creativeness of post-war Yugoslavia. In time they also became part of the European and world painter's scene and esthetic, and many of them gave an exceptional contribution to Serbian and Yugoslav art and had therefore written in their name forever into the history of Serbia.

1.6 “Old Fairground – A Gestapo Concentration Camp”
– A Place of Remembrance

On the ten year anniversary of the First Serbian Uprising (note on translation: uprising against the Ottomans, 1804 – 1813), on Bezanijska Kosa at the place where in December of 1944 victims’ corpses were exhumed, the first monument dedicated to the victims of the Old Fairground Concentration Camp was unveiled. However, the Old Fairground itself, as a place where executions took place, remained unmarked in this respect for full three decades. The first monument dedicated to victims of the concentration camp there was unveiled in 1974 on the thirtieth anniversary of the liberation of Belgrade. The plaque was placed on the wall of one of the buildings, near what used to be the concentration camp's entrance. It is not known who was the person that placed the plaque there, but later it was removed only to be replaced with a new one with an identical text. A decade later, in 1984, at the place where the Romanian pavilion was (which later were demolished), on the grassy plain between the central tower and the Turkish pavilion, a new plaque was placed to commemorate the Concentration camp of the Old Fairground, where more than 40,000 human beings were killed.

The Concentration camp of the Old Fairground, where more than 40,000 human beings were killed, remained unmarked in this respect for full three decades. The first monument dedicated to victims of the concentration camp there was unveiled in 1974 on the thirtieth anniversary of the liberation of Belgrade. The plaque was placed on the wall of one of the buildings, near what used to be the concentration camp's entrance. It is not known who was the person that placed the plaque there, but later it was removed only to be replaced with a new one with an identical text.
40,000 people were executed. The Presidency of the Municipal Department of the Federation of Associations of Veterans of the People’s Fight for the Liberation of Serbia (SUBNOR) and the Municipality of the Old Fairground made the decision to put up the plaque, while it was unveiled by then mayor of Belgrade, Bogdan Bogdanović, as part of the celebration of the Uprising Day in Serbia.

In 1987 the Belgrade City Assembly decided to make “The Old Fairground – A Gestapo Concentration Camp” a cultural good. At that same Assembly session a decision was also reached that a monument should be built on river banks next to where the camp used to be. The monument to the victims of genocide was unveiled on April 22nd, 1995 in front of the Old Fairground complex on Novi Beograd, on the occasion of the fifty year anniversary of liberation from fascism. It was done in accordance with the design of sculptor Miodrag Popović, as an abstract composition symbolizing the 48,000 victims of the camp. It consists of two compositional elements, made of bronze, which rise up directly from the ground to a height of 10 meters. The monument lies on the axis of the central tower of the Old Fairground, on the clearing between Branko’s Bridge and the Old Bridge. Two bronze plaques with lettering in both Serbian and English languages are located on the stairs leading to the monument. The monument to the victims of genocide, with its position and symbolic meaning, accomplishes a special compactness and a compactness of ideas with the whole complex of the Old Fairground.

2. Value of the Monument and the Valorization of the Old Fairground

The Cultural Good of the “Old Fairground-Gestapo Concentration Camp” had the following value:

CULTURAL VALUES

Historic Value

At this place Serbia had lost around 7000 of its citizens of Jewish nationality (during Judenlager Semlin), and then around 33000 citizens of Serbian and other nationalities and different political orientations (during Anhaltslager Semlin). The concentration camp at the Old Fairground was not the biggest German camp not only on the territory of today’s Serbia but also in South-Eastern Europe.

“In only four months (December 1941 – March 1942) more than 7000 Jews were killed in the camp, and Serbia was the first country in Europe in which the “Jewish question was solved”. After the Jews were executed, the concentration camp at the Fairground became a killing field of captured partisan and chetnik fighters, as well as civilians captured in areas fighting took place. By April 1944 around ninety thousand people had passed through, and around forty thousand were killed in the “Transitional Camp Zemun”. (Milan Koljanin, The German Camp At Old Fairground, Belgrade 1992).

The historical significance of this structure also lies in the fact that this was the place where the first industrial fair in the Kingdom of Yugoslavia (1937 – 1941) took place, the place that witnessed the manufacture, industrial and trade ambitions which were of national importance.

Lastly, at the place which till recently was a killing field, after liberation the General Directorate for the Development of Novi Beograd was established (new city, new world). With that the Old Fairground became the place from which the new city on the left bank of the Sava River would be built, and therefore it also again became an active participant in creating the history of the Yugoslav capitol.

Identity

The killing fields of the Old Fairground are an important element of the Serbian Jewish community’s identity. For that reason

2. Gedenkwert und Auswertung von Staro Sajmište

Der Wert des Kulturguts „Gestapolager Staro Sajmište“ lässt sich auf folgende Aspekte gliedern:

KULTURWERT

Historischer Wert

An diesem Ort verlor Serbien um die 7.000 Leben seiner jüdischen Bürger (zur Zeit des Judenlagers Semlin), daraufhin weitere 33.000 Bürger serbischer und anderer ethnischer Angehörigkeit und mit unterschiedlichen politischen Auffassungen (zur Zeit des Anhaltslagers Semlin). Das deutsche Lager am alten Messegelände war nicht nur das größte deutsche Lager auf dem Gebiet des heutigen Serbiens sondern in Südosteuropa überhaupt.

„Innerhalb von nur vier Monaten (Dezember 1941 – März 1942) verloren über 7.000 Juden im Lager das Leben, während Serbien zum ersten „judentreuen” Land wurde. Nach Massenhinrichtungen der jüdischen Bevölkerung wurde das Lager Staro Sajmište zur Hinrichtungsstätte von Kämpfern aus Reihen der Partisanen und Tschetniks sowie von Zivilisten, welche in Kriegsgebieten gefangen genommen wurden. Bis April 1944 kehrten um die 90.000 Menschen in Anhaltslager Semlin ein, etwa 40.000 wurden hingerichtet.“ (Ma Milan Koljanin, Das deutsche Lager am alten Messegelände, Belgrad 1992)

Auf den historischen Wert dieses Kulturguts weist auch die Tatsache hin, dass sich an diesem Ort die erste Handelsmesse im Königreich Jugoslawien befand (1937-1941), sodass das alte Messegelände von wirtschaftlichen, industriellen und handwerksskünstlerischen Errungenschaften von nationaler Bedeutung Zeugnis ablegt.

Letzten Endes enstand nach der Befreiung an Stelle der einstigen Hinrichtungsstätte der offizielle Sitz der Generalbaudirektion für Neu-Belgrad (eine neue Gesellschaft, eine neue Welt). So wurde Staro Sajmište zum Grundstein, von welchem aus die Errichtung einer neuen Stadt am linken Save-Ufer begann, und dadurch erneut zum aktiven Element in der Geschichte der jugoslawischen Hauptstadt.

Identität

Die Hinrichtungsstätte am alten Messegelände ist ein bedeutendes Identitätselement der jüdischen Gemeinde in Serbien. Aus
Mixed usage - Artists’ studios, low grade areas for housing and business
Mischenutzung - Künstlerateliers, minderwertige Wohn- und Geschäftsflächen
МЕШОВИТА НАМЕНА - УМЕТНИЧКИ АТЕЉЕИ, СУБСТАНДАРДНО СТАНОВАЊЕ, КОМЕРЦИЈАЛА

The Memorial
Das Denkmal
Спомен обележје

▲ Memorial for the Victims of Genocide and Resistance against fascist Terror in the Sajmište Camp
Denkmal für die Opfer von Völkermord und Widerstand gegen den faschistischen Terror im Lager Sajmište
СПОМЕНIK ЖРТВАМА ГЕНОЦИДА И ОТПОРА ФАШИСТИЧКОМ ТЕРОРУ У ЛОГОРУ САЈМИШТЕ

■ Commemorative Plaque for the Victims of the Staro Sajmište Camp
Gedenktafel für die Opfer des Lagers von Staro Sajmište
СПОМЕН - ПЛОЧА ЖРТВАМА ЛОГОРА "СТАРО САЈМИШТЕ"

1. Artists living and working space / Künstlerateliers und -wohnungen / УМЕТНИЧКИ АТЕЉЕИ И СТАНОВАЊЕ
2. Office building private comp. / Verwaltung Privatfirma / УПРАВНА ЗГРАДА - ПОСЛОВАЊЕ
3. Private commercial use / Private geschäftliche Nutzung - ПОСЛОВАЊЕ
4. Artists living and working space / Künstlerateliers und -wohnungen / УМЕТНИЧКИ АТЕЉЕИ И СТАНОВАЊЕ
5. Artists living and working space / Künstlerateliers und -wohnungen / УМЕТНИЧКИ АТЕЉЕИ И СТАНОВАЊЕ
6. Habitation / Wohnungen / СТАНОВАЊЕ
7. Habitation / Wohnungen / СТАНОВАЊЕ
8. Restaurant / Ресторан
9. Transformer / Trafo-Station / ТРАФО СТАНИЦА
10. Habitation / Wohnungen / ОБЈЕКТИ СТАМБЕНЕ НАМЕНЕ
11. Kosharska School - Education / Koscharska Schule - Erziehung / КОЖАРСКА ШКОЛА - ОБРАЗОВАЊЕ
12. div. commercials usage / versch. geschäftliche Verwendung / ОБЈЕКТИ ПОСЛОВНЕ НАМЕНЕ
there is great emotional connectedness of this community to the said space.

Architectural-Urban Value

The architectural-urban solution of the Fairground, planned as a complex of a symmetrical axis with a central tower, represents an expression of victory of modernism in Belgrade in the thirties (last century). The architecture of the pavilions within the complex gave a major contribution to the development and representation of Belgrade’s modern architecture. Unfortunately, after the destruction at the end of the Second World War (bombing of Belgrade in 1944), only a small part of what used to be the Fairground complex has been preserved, and therefore, due to low levels of authenticity we may talk about the missing rather than the preserved architectural-urban values.

The Old Fairground was the first urbanized space on the left bank of the Sava River. Belgrade had made its first steps onto the other side of the Sava River with the construction of the Fairground pavilions in the space between Branko’s Bridge and the Old Railway Bridge, and it had therefore opened up the way for future architects of Novi Beograd.

The Importance in Belgrade’s Arts Scene

Once the youth brigades left in 1951 artists from the Association of Fine Artists of Serbia moved into the former Fairground pavilions, and they created an art colony for painters where many avant-garde ideas were hatched and many important works of modern Serbian and Yugoslavian art were created. A few artists became members of the Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts, and many of them also became a part of the European and the world’s painting arts scene. Through their artistic work, which originated in the artists’ studios of the Old Fairground, they marked a whole period of Serbian art and are therefore forever written into the cultural history of Serbia.

Uniqueness

The uniqueness and representational capacity of the Old Fairground can be found in the fact that it was the first and only industrial fair in the Kingdom of Yugoslavia, and in the fact that during the Second World War the largest German concentration camp on the territories of today’s Serbia.

Das alte Messegelände stellte auch den ersten urban gestalteten Raum am linken Save-Ufer dar. Mit der Errichtung der Messepavillons auf dem Raum zwischen der heutigen Brankov-Most-Brücke und der Alten Eisenbahnbrücke wurde Belgrad erstmals auf das andere Save-Ufer erweitert, womit der Weg für den künftigen Bau Neu-Belgrads gebnet wurde.

Signifikanz für die Kunstszene Belgrads


Einzigartigkeit

Einzigartigkeit und Vorzeigewert von Staro Sajmište äußern sich darin, dass dies die erste und einzige Handelsmesse im Königreich Jugoslawiens war, während es im Zweiten Weltkrieg zum größten deutschen Lager auf dem Gebiet des heutigen Serbiens wurde.

постоји велика емоционална везаност ове заједнице за предметни простор.

Архитектонско-урбанистичка вредност

Архитектонско-урбанистичко решење сајма, концептирано као комплекс симетричне основе са централном кулом, представља израз победе модерне у Београду трдесетих година прошлог века. Велики допринос развоју и репрезентативности београдске модерне архитектуре дала је и архитектура павиљона унутар комплекса. Нажалост, после разарања крајем Другог светског рата (бомбардовање Београда 1944), данас се сачувају мали део некадашњег сајмског комплекса, тако да се, због ниског нивоа аутентичности може више говорити о несталим њег о очуваним архитектонско-урбанистичким вредностима.

Старо сајмиште је било и први урбанизовани простор на левој обали Саве. Изградњом сајмског комплекса на простору између данашњег Бранковог и Старог железничког моста, Београд је први пут искорио на другу обалу Саве и тиме отворио пут будућим градитељима Новог Београда.

Значај у уметничком животу Београда

Одласком омладинских бригада, 1951. године су некадашње сајмске павиљона налазили у предметном простору, чиме је отворен пут за будућу урбанизацију простора и репрезентативност Београда. Својим архитектонским структурама и урбанистичким решењима комплекса, јединственост и репрезентативност сајмског простора, озбиљна ликовна колонија у којој су ниске многе авангардне идеје и остварена значајна дела српске и југословенске уметности. Појединачне уметнике су постали чланови САНУ, а многи од њих део европске и светске ликовне сцени. Својим стваралаштвом пониклих у архитектонском и урбанистичком смислу, сајмишта обележили су читао раздобија српске уметности и тиме су трајно уписане у културну историју Србије.

Реткост

Јединственост и репрезентативност Старог сајмшта огледа се у томе што је оно било први и једини привредни сајм у Краљевини Југославији, а током Другог светског рата највећи немачки логор на данашњој територији Србије.
**Functional Value**

Even though the Old Fairground is characterized by extreme changes of purpose which had happened in a short historical period (total discontinuity of purpose), the remaining structures do have functional potential which may, to a great degree, fulfill the program requirements of cultural goods presentation. New usage purposes would have to be chosen so as to secure remembrance of the Judenlager Semlin and Anhaltlager Semlin victims by forming an adequate memorial complex. Aside from that, the representation of other cultural values of this cultural good must also be done in an adequate way.

**Educational value**

The Old Fairground has great potential for adequate integration in educational programs. Lastly, the key function of the Memorial Complex would be educational and for scientific research purposes. Studying of historical events which took place at this site, especially applying the methodology used by similar institutions around the world would ensure the Old Fairground becoming a leader of such establishments in the South-Eastern Europe. In regards to defining the program of this institution it would be desirable to use the experiences of the Work Group for International Cooperation in Education, Remembrance and Research of the Holocaust and the Memorial Center “Yad Vashem” in Jerusalem.

**Social value**

Orientation toward the individualization of victims (perpetrators, witnesses) will, through the program, direct a series of activities of the Memorial Complex which will have great social value (for instance, for the first time in our country a systematic gathering of and studying of memories would take place). Scientific research of historical occurrences from the Second World War period on the territories of occupied Serbia and the Independent State of Croatia, and the careful, and based on scientific principles, education of different target groups (from children and youth to professors and groups of varying educational backgrounds) would have enormous social value in the goal of preventing neo-fascism, racism, anti-Semitism and violence in general.

**Bildungswert**


**Gesellschaftlicher Wert**


**САВРЕМЕНЕ ДРУШТВЕНО-ЕКОНОМСКЕ ВРЕДНOSTI**

Иако је за Старо сајмиште карактеристична изразита промена намена која је догодила у кратком историјском периоду (потпуни дисконтинуитет намена), сачуване грађевине имају функционални потенцијал којим се у приличној мери могу задовољити програмски захтеви презентације културног добра. Нове намене би морале да буду изабране тако да се обезбеди сећање на жртве judenlager Semlin и Anhaltlager Semlin формирањем одговарајућег меморијалног комплекса. Осим тога, на одговарајући начин се мора омогућити и презентовање осталих културних вредности овога културног добра.

**Образовна вредност**

Старо сајмиште има велики потенцијал за адекватно интегриране у образовне програме. Кончато, кључна функција Меморијалног комплекса била би едукативна и научно-истраживачка. Прочување историјских догађаја који су се одвијали на овоме месту, посебно примене методологије која се примењује у сличним институцијама у свету, обезбедили би да Старо сајмиште постане лидер оваквих установа у Југословенској Европи. За програмско дефинисање ове институције било би пожељно користити искуства Радне групе за међународну сарадњу у области образовања, сећања и истраживања Холокауста и Меморијалног центра „Јад Вашем” у Јерусалиму.
Political value

Our relation to the victims of fascism and the way we remember them are in our society topics of discussions in expert and wider public circles, and only sporadically at that. There are also attempts of historic revisionism and relativism of the crimes committed during the Second World War. By setting up the Memorial Complex as an educational, scientific and cultural institution the state and society would clearly show that they favor applying the principle of preserving memory and testimonies of the victims and of passing on the legacy of the Holocaust and the genocide which happened to the new generations enabling them to be a part of modern, democratic societies. In this sense, the Old Fairground has enormous potential for the state to communicate its part of modern, democratic societies. In this sense, the Old Fairground has enormous potential for the state to communicate its unwavering belief that it is through an adequate relation to historic events that a future based on the ideals of peace, understanding and tolerance is built.

Valorization

The Old Fairground complex is a space of extremely layered and accentuated memory. Only very rare parts of Belgrade have had such a turbulent and difficult fate to bear in such a short period of time. In a relatively short historical period of fourteen years of the Fairground’s past it is possible to separate three clear, strong and recognizable historical periods on this space that define its historical, urban-architectural, memorial and cultural value. It was conceptualized and built as a representative fairground space which was to show the ambitions of the young European kingdom and be an incentive to its economic growth. During the Second World War the German occupation forces turn the complex into a concentration camp where tens of thousands of people were tortured and killed. After the War, the new authorities place the Old Fairground directly to serve the purpose of helping build the new city, only to later have it infused with creative energy which attempted to lessen the recent tragedy.

With the construction of the First Belgrade Fairground, which was constructed through the effort of Serbian industrialists, merchants and the Belgrade Municipality in 1937, on the space be-

Politicalischer Wert


Auswertung


Indem 1937, durch Bemühungen serbischer Industrieller und Händler wie auch der Belgrader Gemeinde, zwischen der heutigen Brankov-Most-Brücke und der Alten Eisenbahnhbrücke die

ВАЛОРИЗАЦИЈА

Комплекс Старог сајмишта је простор најскољепитије и најизраженије меморије. Ретко који део Београда је за кратко време имао толику буруну и тешку судбину. За релативно кратак историјски период од четрнаест година на овом простору могу да се изводе три јасне, снажне и препознатљиве историјске периоде, која утврђују његове историјске, урбанистико-архитектонске, меморијалне и културолошке вредности. Осмишљен је и реализован као репрезентативан сајмски простор који је требало да покаже амбиције младе европске краљевине и буде подстријек њеном економском развоју. У Другом светском рату немачке окопнице снаге превратају комплекс у концентрациони логор у коме је убијено и мучено десетине хиљаде људи. Након рата, нове власти простор Старог сајмишта непосредно стављају у функцију изградње новог града, да би га потом населили креативном енергијом која је покушала да ублажи недавну трагедију.

Изградњом Првог београдског сајма, који је подигнут напорима српских индустриталаца, трговаца и Београдске општине 1937. године, на простору између данашњег Бранковог
were already prepared in Jajinci. In only four months more than
ders were killed on route from the camp to mass burials pits which
ment of the camp’s authorities, while others went to die a horrible
executing the Jewish and Roma populace of Belgrade and Serbia.
grade Fair became a place of horrible sufferin In December of
War to a space of infamy.
advancement of trade in goods and the industrial betterment of
industrial endeavors of pre-war Yugoslav society. It was built to be
same time represents a symbol of technological advancement and

With the outbreak of the Second World War the First Belgrade Fair became a place of horrible sufferin In December of 1941 the Gestapo established a concentration camp Judenlager Semlin (Jewish Concentration Camp Zemun) for the purposes of executing the Jewish and Roma populace of Belgrade and Serbia. Many prisoners died of hunger, cold, illness and inhumane treat-
ment of the camp's authorities, while others went to die a horrible death in the gas-trucks. Every day, Jewish children, women and el-
ders were killed on route from the camp to mass burials pits which were already prepared in Jajinci. In only four months more than
first Belgrader Messe erbaut wurde, weitete sich die Stadt erst-
mals zum anderen Save-Ufer aus, was den Weg für den künfti-

Mit dem Ausbruch des Zweiten Weltkrieges wird das erste Bel-
grader Messegebäude einer erschreckenden Hinrichtungstätte. Im Dezember 1941 richtet die Gestapo das Judenlager Semlin zur Ausrottung der jüdischen Bevölkerung und der Roma in Bel-
grad und Serbien ein. Viele der Gefangenen sterben an Hunger, Kälte, Krankheit und am unheimlichen Umgang der Lagerver-
waltung, während dem Rest ein grausamer Tod in einem eigens
gedacht und in einem speziellen Fahrzeug befördert wird. Täglich
wurden jüdische Kinder, Frauen und Greise auf ihrem Weg vom Lager zu den bereitstehenden Massengräbern im Dorf Jajinci

избијањем другог светског рата, први београдски сајам постао је место стравничког страдања. децембра 1941. године, Гестапо је формирао концентрациони логор Зигенлаагер Семлин (Јеврејски логор Земун) ради ликвидације јеврејског и ромског становништва у Београду и Србији. Мога загонетици су страдали од глади, хладне, болести и нечовечног понашања логорске управе, а остали су доживели страшну смрт у специјалном камену-гасној комори. Саводневно, јеврејске деца, жене и старци убијани су на путу од логора до већ припремљених масовних рака у селу Јајинци. За само
7000 Jews died in the concentration camp, and Serbia became the second country in Europe, after Estonia, in which the "Jewish question was solved". The Judenlager Semlin is not only the place of Serbia's Jews biggest suffering in occupied Serbia, but it is also one of the first concentration camps in Europe where the local German administration, with the help of the Berlin government, carried out mass executions of Jews. Jews were the only group of prisoners in the camp who were victims of planned, systematic and total annihilation. Aside from the important place the Jewish Concentration Camp on the Fairground has in overall history of the annihilation of European Jews, it is also crucial to the history of the Holocaust in Serbia.

After the murdering of Jews ended, the concentration camp at the Fairground became a killing field of captured partisan and chetnik fighters, as well as civilians captured in areas where fighting took place. Executions of prisoners took place continuously, while a frighteningly high number of lives were taken by illness, hunger, exhaustion and continuous torture. By April 1944 around ninety thousand people had passed through the "Transitory Concentration Camp Zemun", as it was renamed, while around forty thousand were killed. The concentration camp at the Old Belgrade Fairground was not only the biggest German concentration camp in Serbia but also in the European South-East and as such, it bears strong testimony for this tragic period of our recent history.

With the liberation of Belgrade and establishment of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia the place where the Fairground was, and subsequently the concentration camp, was significantly changed in regards to its purpose and function. When the decision was made to develop Novi Beograd the terrain of the Old Fairground directly became a place of construction of the new city on the left bank of the Sava River and thus it again became an active participant in the making of the history of the Yugoslav capital. After the youth brigades left the one time Fairground and concentration camp pavilions were inhabited by artists from the Association of Fine Artists of Serbia, who created an artist colony of sorts where many avant-garde ideas cropped up and many important works of art of modern Serbian and Yugoslavian art were made. A few artists became members of the Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts, and many of them also became a part of the European and world's painting arts scene. Through their artistic work, which originated in the artists’ studios of the Old Fairground, they marked a whole period of Serbian art and are therefore forever written into the cultural history of Serbia.


Nach dem Massenmord an Juden wurde das Lager Staro Sajmište zum Galgen für gefangene Kämpfer aus Reihen der Partisanen und Tschinetski sowie für die in Kriegsgebieten gefangen genommenen Zivilisten. Die Tötung der Gefangenen dauerte unentwegt an, während eine erschreckende Anzahl von Menschen ihr Leben wegen Krankheit, Hunger, Erschöpfung und Folter verlor. Bis April 1944 kehrten etwa 90.000 Menschen ins Anhaltslager Semlin, wie der neue Name lautete, ein; um die 40.000 wurden ums Leben gebracht. Das Lager am alten Messegelände in Belgrad war das größte deutsche Lager nicht nur im besetzten Serbien sondern in ganz Südosteuropa, und ist somit prägender Beleg dieses tragischen Abschnitts in unserer jüngeren Geschichte.


Nakov pogubljenja Jerveja, logor na Sajmištu je postao stratište zarobljenih partizanskih i četničkih borača kao i cивила uhađenih na području ranih dejstava. Likvidacija zatvorenika je neprekidno trajala, a zastrašujući broj luđkih života oduvržen je i bolest, glad, iscrpljenost i stalna tortura. Do aprila 1944. godine korak po korak otkrivao „Prihvativi logor Zemun”, kako mu je glasio novi naziv, prošlo je oko devdeset hiljada ljudi, ali ubijeno je oko četrdeset hiljada. Logor na Starom beogradskom sajmištu bio je najveći stratište u kojem je već sa 1944. godine i ono drugo logora u Europi.

Ослобођењем Београда и успостављањем ФНРЈ простору на коме се налазио први сајм а потом концентрационог логора битно је промењена намена и функција. Одлуком о изградњи новог Београда, терен Сајмишта је непосредно постао место изградње новог града на левој обали Саве и на тај начин поново постао активни учесник у стварању историје југословенске престонице. Одласком омладинских бригада некадашње сајмске локалне администрације навиيكا се у Европи и Србији, у којој су накле многе авангардне идеје и остварена значајна дела савремене српске и југословенске уметности. Поједини уметници су стигли чланови САНУ, а многи од њих део европске и светске ликовне сцени. Свежим стваралаштвом понижељним у атмосферама Сајмиштена обележили су читав раздобље српске уметности и тиме су трајно уписани у културну историју Србије.
The Old Fairground is the only part of Belgrade which during its fourteen year history has three layers of urban memory. From being a symbol of urban, architectural and industrial advancement it was turned into a killing field, into a symbol of suffering and agony, and then into a symbol of avant-garde ideas of the Serbian cultural scene. The one time breeding ground of modern spaces became a “legacy never to be forgotten”. During the German occupation it got the role of being one of the most inhumane places of torture of recent history, and has made an unavoidable place in the history of this city, which must be remembered and marked. The Old Fairground is a monument and a memorial whose task is to list the names of all Jews, Roma, Serbs, and victims of other nationalities, but also the names of those who tried to save these people, risking their lives doing it. Keeping in mind the lasting inscriptions of history and symbolism of this space the Old Fairground represents the most important memorial complex not just in Belgrade but on the total territory of Serbia.


City of Belgrade - Cultural Heritage Preservation Agency
Град Београд — Завод за споменике културе

3. IDEAS ABOUT THE FUTURE OF THE OLD FAIRGROUND – URBANISM PLANS AND INITIATIVES


In the post-war years the expert circles held the opinion that the Fairground complex isn’t worth restoring The General Urban Plan from 1950 foresaw the demolition of the Old Fairground. That location was treated as an integral part of the river bank park, and various cultural content was planned for this space. The solution for the river bank area was seen as having it be a quiet space intended for rest, while further in the background, in the spacious parks, public structures were planned. The same idea was pursued by the Novi Beograd Regulation Plan from 1962, and seconded by the Previous Urban Conditions for a competition on the ideal solution for the Belgrade Opera building and a collection of public structures in Block 17 in Novi Beograd from 1970.


3. IDEEN ÜBER DIE ZUKUNFT VON STARO SAJMISTE – URBANISTISCHE PLÄNE UND INITIATIVEN

UGP 1950, Regulierungsplan für Neu-Belgrad 1962


3. ИДЕЕ О БУДУЋНОСТИ СТАРОГ САЈМИШТА -УРБАНИСТИЧКИ ПЛАНОВИ И ИНИЦИЈАТИВЕ


Град Београд — Завод за споменике културе
Интернационални конкурс за изградњу Опере, 1971.

Одлуком Скупштине града Београда од 25.11.1968. године одлучено је да локација Београдске опере буде у блоку 17 као делу градске територије са највећим потенцијалним могућностима за будући развој. Блок 17 је само део једне специфичне географске целине коју чини ток реке Саве у централном делу града заједно са приобалним зонама, чијим уређењем може да се претвори у највећи део Београда.

Забележено је да из 1970. године нас обавештава да на терену планираног блока постоје различите садржаји (павиљони, бараке, магацини и сл.), од којих се скоро ни један не може сматрати трнарним у односу на већ споменуте Генерални и Регулациони план. Простор је окрајен тако како тици за периферне запуштене делове великих градова које треба очистити од нехигијенских зграда. Процес уређења/чишћења који би изградњом Опере и других јавних објеката у наредних десет година требало да буде завршен, предвиђао је етапу изградње, као последицу недовољног капацитета мостова на реци Сави и самог решења зграде Опере и ансамбла у целости.

Опере би поред Музеја савремене уметности требало да чини један од најзначајнијих објеката, као део централне зоне будућег града. То би био важан потез при постављању два дела града, као и дефинитиван излазак Београда на обале. Предвиђено је да сама зграда Опере са својом инфраструктуром заузима око 4хака, а остале објекти ансамбла око 8хака, док је 12хака одређено за слободне, зелене површине.

На конкурс за изградњу Опере који је трајао до 3.5.1971. године, прва награда је додељена раду под шифром „102-102“, чији су аутори архитекти Hans Dal и Torben Lindhardsen, са сарадницима из Helzinger-Danska. Пројекат опере није изведен.


“The third millennium, the new cultural center of Belgrade, if it is built in accordance with the program envisioned by a small group of enthusiasts, urbanism experts and architects, will most certainly open up what today seems to be unfathomable possibilities of communicating with the whole world. For one community, which it may be said is xenophobic to a greater degree such as our is, this could represent the “missing link” for a more spontaneous acceptance of innovation and reducing the technological and cultural divide which is becoming all the more worrisome”.

“When analyzing all possible locations for such a cultural center the Sava Amphitheater and the space on the opposing bank of the Sava River on the Novi Beograd side present themselves as obvious and irreplaceable solutions. These valuable parts of the city, in the city center, which are today filled by chaos of railway machinery, neglected unhygienic settlements, man’s land, degraded by uncaring and negligence, create on the map of Belgrade a misconception of a city whose heart has been ripped out by inconsiderate and unsystematic planning…” (Milos R. Perovic, Center of Culture in the III Millennium: Urban Concept, 89 – 119, in “Center of Culture in the III Millennium, SANU, 1985).

Mihajlo Mitrovic in his work, following historical examples as an incentive to new construction approaches, takes Pueblo Bonito as a model (the first known plan of a collective settlement, built as a unified structure for members of the tribal community), and creates a horseshoe shaped Sava Pueblo, which stretches from where the roads to the bridge begin where the amphitheater terraces are located one next to each other toward the river and the historic silhouette of Belgrade.

In its concept the Sava Pueblo is reminiscent of structural establishment on the river, a sort of modern match to Kalemegdan, which should protect its citizens from isolation and threats from new super-civilization insecurities. This is why the Sava Pueblo had through its architecture closed itself off from Novi Beograd and completely opened itself up to its interior, the urban court yard – soldiers on the river which connect it to old Belgrade.

In the Pueblo settlement there were numerous structures intended as living quarters, for business, services, and culture and sport. Only two structures would have remained from the Old Fairground: the central tower – the architectural monument of sport. Only two structures would have remained from the Old Yard – soldiers on the river which connect it to old Belgrade.


Historischen Erfahrungen als Anspruch für neue Herangehensweisen im Bauwesen folgend, nennt Mihajlo Mitrović in seiner Arbeit Pueblo Bonito als Modell, als ersten bekannten Plan einer Kollektivbebauung, erbaut in Form eines einheitlichen Objektes für Angehörige von Klangemeinden, und schafft ein hufeisenförmiges Pueblo an der Save, welches sich neben den Zugängen zu den beiden Brücken erstrecken würde, mit zum Fluss und zur historischen Silhouette Belgrads gemeinten Terrassen.

In seinem Konzept lehnt sich das Sava-Pueblo an die Struktur der Nutzung des Flusses an, eine Art modernes Gegenstück zum Kalemegdan, die seine Bürger vor Isolation und vor den Un sicherheiten einer neuen Super-Zivilisation schützen sollte. Darin liegt der Grund, warum das Sava-Pueblo sich durch seine Architektur ganz von Neu-Belgrad absondert und sich nach innen öffnet zum urbanen Innenhof - Soldaten auf dem Fluss der es mit dem, alten Belgrad verbindet.

Der Komplex Pueblo umfasst zahlreiche Bauten, von Wohnobjekten, verschiedenen Geschäft- und Servicräumen bis hin zu Kultur- und Freizeitanlagen. Die äußeren Segmente des Pueblo würden für öffentliche Inhalte eingesetzt werden, während der innere Teil für Wohnhäuser vorgesehen wäre. Von Staro Sajmište „Трећи милијум, нови културни центар Београда уколико буде изграђен према програму који је мала група ентузијаста, урбаниста и архитекте замислила, свакако ће отворити данас несуђене могућности комуникација са целим светом. За једну, могло би се рећи у приличној мери ксенофобску средину каква је наша то би могла да буде „карика која недостаје” ка спонтанитету прихваћању иновација и смањењу технолошког и културног јаза који све више забринува.

Када се анализирају могуће локације једног оваквог културног средишта, Савски амфитеатар, а простори на наспрамној обали реке Саве у Новом Београду намећу се само по себи као скоро незамениво решење. Ти вредни простори града у самом средишту града, данас испуњени хаосом желеznичких постројења, запуштених некадашњих насеља, непажљивом и непосредном, стварају на карти Београда привид града које је непакложивим и несистематичним планирањем и изградњом изучано само Срце…” (Милош Р. Перовић, Средиште културе III милијума:урбанилошко концепт, 89-119, у: „Средиште културе III милијума“, SANU, 1985).

Михајло Митровић у својом раду, пратећи историјска искуства као подстичај новим градитељским приступима, као модел узима Пуебло Бонито, прави познати план колективног насеља, изградњени у облику јединственог објекта за становнике родовских заједница и ствара потковична савски пуебло, који се протеже уз наводе два моста са ампитеатралним терасама које се ниже према реци и историјској силинети Београда.

Савски пуебло у свом концепту носи у себи реминисценције грађевинске утврде на реци, неку врсту модерног пандана Калемегдана, који треба да брани своје становнике од отуђености и претње од нових суперцивилизационих непажљивости. Због тога се савски пуебло затворио својом архитектуром према Новом Београду а потпуно отвори својој унутрашњости, уграном дворишту-реду на реци која га повезује са старим Београдом.

У грађевини пуебло сменшени су многобројни садржаји од становљања, разних пословних простора, сервиса, до простора намењених културним и рекреационим. Спользење стране пуебла припале би јавним садржајима а унутрашњост становљању. Од Старог сајмишта задржала би се само два објекта: централна
been adapted to fit the needs of Belgrade artists, as homage to their historical presence on this space, which is considered to be one of the greatest breeding grounds of post-war modern Serbian art. These structures accompanied by a big sculpture at the end of the construction site, on the very banks of the Sava River, would have represented the base of the memorial marking of historical events from a time when this was a concentration camp. The unoccupied, green spaces were envisioned to be big park spaces with children's and sports fields, all of which was bordered by a one story structure in the shape of a horseshoe and filled with small shops, cafés, restaurants, skilled tradesmen's workshops, galleries, art studios. The Sava channel would have entered into the park field, and end in a lake.

International Open Competition for the Advancement of Urban Structures of Novi Beograd, 1986

In 1986 the International Open Competition for the Advancement of Urban Structures of Novi Beograd was commenced. There are three types of distinct ideas which relate to the location of the Old Fairground and the three bridges:

• Those that tried to integrate new public buildings with mostly live content (stores, restaurants, clubs, stages on the water as well as apartments) into the space, and hence make this a pedestrian region.

• Those that proposed the solution to developing this space in more green surfaces on Novi Beograd in those areas which are being developed first and foremost by the river front, and by changing the Old Fairground into a space for clubs; and which saw the biggest problem as being how to reconnect Novi Beograd to old Belgrade – this connection was seen as being accomplished by building a new central place, building new central urban tissue, which is located on both the left and right banks of the Sava River and the special Sava amphitheaters and the Old Fairground, as well as in constructing a new pedestrian bridge.

• Those that, onto the space of the Old Fairground settlement, applied the conceptual platform which is remembrance of Dubrovnik. Among the many ideas there were those which


Internationales Ausschreiben für die Einrichtung der urbanistischen Struktur Neu-Belgrads 1986

Im Jahr 1986 wurde das Internationale Ausschreiben für die Einrichtung der urbanistischen Struktur Neu-Belgrads veranstaltet. Unter den Ideen zur Einrichtung des Gebietes um das alte Messegelände sowie der Zone um die drei Brücken sind folgende Gruppen zu nennen:

• Entwürfe, laut denen neue öffentliche Bauten vorwiegend lebendigen Inhalts (Geschäfte, Restaurants, Klubs, eine Bühne am Wasser sowie Wohnobjekte) in den Raum integriert werden sollten, um das Gebiet zu einer Fußgängerzone zu machen;

• Entwürfe, laut denen in Neu-Belgrad ringweise Grünfläche angebaut werden sollten, vorwiegend am Fluss, und Staro Sajmište zu Klubs umzugestalten wäre. Diesen Konzepten nach lag das Hauptproblem in der Verbindung des alten Teils der Stadt mit Neu-Belgrad: diese Verbindung wird durch die Einrichtung eines neuen Zentrums geknüpft, d.h. durch Einrichtung einer zentralen Urbanregion, welche sich am linken wie auch am rechten Save-Ufer erstrecken sowie das Save-Amphitheater und Staro Sajmište umfassen würde und im Rahmen welcher der Bau einer Fußgängerbrücke vorgesehen wäre;

• Entwürfe, laut denen im Gebiet des alten Messegeländes ein Schema der Anlegung an Dubrovnik angewandt werden sollte. Unter den Konzepten sind auch solche zu nennen, laut

Međ. конкурс за унапређење урбане структуре Новог Београда, 1986.

Године 1986. одржан је Међународни конкурс за унапређење урбане структуре Новог Београда. Међу идејама које су се односило на део Старог сајмишта као и зоне три моста издавају се оне које су:

• сматрали да у простор треба интегрисати нове јавне зграде са претежно живим садржајем (радње, ресторани, клубови, позорница на води као и станови) како би се ово подручје учинило пешачким;

• решење уређења видела у озељењавању Новог Београда у појасевима који се развијају првенствено поред реке и претварању Старог сајмишта у клубски простор; које су главни проблем видела у повезивању старог и Новог Београда- та веза се остварује кроз изградњу новог средишта, изградњу централног урбаног ткива, које заузима леву и десну обалу Саве и просторе савског акфитера и Старог сајмишта као и изградњу пешачког моста;

• у простору насеља Старог сајимишта применити шему која је сећање на Дубровник. Међу идејама се издавају и оне које су оживљавање зоне три моста виделе у изградњи
Detail Urban Plan – DUP of the “Old Belgrade Fairground” complex, 1992

In 1992 the Belgrade City Assembly adopted the DUP of the memorial complex “Old Belgrade Fairground”. The plan’s goal was to “create conditions for the reconstruction of the memorial complex and building a monument, as well as top priority activities”.

The basic idea of the Old Fairground reconstruction is based on the permanent safe-keeping and restoration of the existing, authentic structures, building new ones at the space of those that have been demolished and the restoration of the first urban solution. This way would ensure the reconstruction of what was once an urban whole, while the authentic fair pavilions, standing today, would have the special context in which they were created. In regards to new purposes it was suggested to have the Spasic pavilion and some other of the pavilions that remained standing used for a memorial to the concentration camp, while the whole area of the fairground should have been partially and in a adequate way marked by reconstruction or interpolation of elements which would in a certain way be a reminder of the concentration camp. Exhibition spaces and art studios can be kept in an adequate way, while authentic pavilions, remaining standing, might be used for content similar to purposes of a fair but also have them used for content similar to purposes of a fair but also for the permanent center of arts-crafts-exhibit-memorial center; with an urban whole, while the authentic fair pavilions, standing to-day, would have the special context in which they were created. In regards to new purposes it was suggested to have the Spasic pavilion and some other of the pavilions that remained standing used for a memorial to the concentration camp, while the whole area of the fairground should have been partially and in a adequate way marked by reconstruction or interpolation of elements which would in a certain way be a reminder of the concentration camp. Exhibition spaces and art studios can be kept in an adequate way, while authentic pavilions, remaining standing, might be used for content similar to purposes of a fair but also for the permanent center of arts-crafts-exhibit-memorial center;

The overall goal must be kept in focus – that the said content in its manifestation and function does not offend the memory of human suffering, as well as making it possible to raise the esthetic value of the whole space, and not vice versa.

UDT des Gedenkkomplexes „Altes Belgrader Messegelände“ 1992


The overall goal must be kept in focus – that the said content in its manifestation and function does not offend the memory of human suffering, as well as making it possible to raise the esthetic value of the whole space, and not vice versa.

welchen der Wiederaufbau der Drei-Brücken-Zone durch Errichtung von Hotelkomplexen und mit vorgesehener Funktion des Ortes als Kunst-, Handwerks-, Ausstellungs- und Gedenkstätte erfolgen sollte;

• Entwürfe, laut denen das Gebiet zwischen des Sava Centar und des Save-Ufers für die Einrichtung eines fortwährenden Zentrums der Blockfreien Staaten mit Zusatzbauten oder für die Einrichtung eines Gedenkparks und einer Reihen von Ateliers, des „Belgrader Montmartre“, genutzt werden sollte.

• Entwürfe laut denen auf dem alten Messegelände ein Sportzentrum errichtet und Staro Sajmište zum „Belgrader Prater“ werden sollte!

• простор између Сава центра и савске обале предвиђају за изградњу сталног центра несврстаних земаља, с претежним садржајима или формирању спомен-парка и скупине атељеа-београдског „Монмартра“.

• постојане су и идеје да се на простору насеља Старо сајмиште изгради спортски центар и да се Старо сајмиште претвори у Пратер!


Основна идеја реконструкције простора Старог сајмишта се темељи на трајном чувању и рестаурацији постојећих, аутентичних објеката, изградњи нових зграда на местима и у габаритима порушеног сајмског павиљона и обнови пропорционалних урбанистичког решења. На тај начин се реконструише некадашња урбанистичка целина, а аутентичним сајмским павиљонима, до данас очуваним, се обезбеђује простори контекст у коме су настанали. У погледу нових намена, предложено је да Спасићев павиљон и још неки од очуваних павиљона послуже за обележавање сећања на логор, а цела површина сајмишта местимички и на прикласдан начин треба да се обележи реконструкцијом или интерпретацијом елемената који би на одређени начин асоцирани на период логора. У осталом сачуваним павиљонима могу се на прикласдан начин сачувати атеље и изложбено простори. Нови објекти, који би требало да се подигну на местима несталих павиљона, могу да буду намењени садржајима сличним сајмским, али да буду пропорционалне намене, прек играх нашећег културног садржаја. Мора се имати у виду циљ да ти садржаји својом мануфактури и функцијом не вријеју сећање на људске патнице, као и да омогућавају да се подишу естетске вредности укупног простора, а не обрнуто.
The DUP from 1992 has to this day remained unrealized, except for the memorial monument which was raised to the victims of genocide and the fact that the river bank was cleared and developed.

“Europolis” - Belgrade on the Sava River Project, 1995

One of the heirs of the royalty rights of one of the First Belgrade Fairground developers - architect Rajko Tatic – Darko Tatic, in 1995 brought forth and argued in favor of his proposition for the reconstruction of the architectural-urban complex Old Fairground, its revitalization as the old center of the new city on the left bank of the Sava River, and lastly its functional connection to the new purposes and content of the EUROPOLIS-BELGRADE ON THE SAVA RIVER project. The project applicant thought that it was necessary to include the idea of restoring the complex in the international open competition Europolis-Belgrade on the Sava River, intended to start in 1996. Therefore he began the discussion on this topic and called on all individuals and relevant institutions to give their point of view. His idea was supported by the Serbian Society of Art Historians.

In regards to the reasons for the restoration of the complex Darko Tatic stated that the Old Fairground is a monument to the Serbian, Yugoslavian, worker’s spirit, entrepreneurship, industry, trade and creative potentials. He also represented it as a symbol of suffering, pain and destruction. He thought that the act of restoring the Fair would mean not only showing respect for the past and identity, but would also serve as a monument to our self-consciousness. Tatic was against restoration of the Fair in regards to the concentration camp, but thought that one pavilion should be changed into a museum. Regarding the state of existing pavilions, degree of how well preserved the previous plans and concepts of Europolis. Stepping out onto the banks, accord- ing to Tatic, opens up the possibility of creating several intricate complexes in the international open competition Europolis-Belgrade on the Sava River, intended to start in 1996. Therefore he began the discussion on this topic and called on all individuals and relevant institutions to give their point of view. His idea was supported by the Serbian Society of Art Historians.


**Projekt „Europolis – Belgrad an der Save“ 1995**


In regards to the reasons for the restoration of the complex Darko Tatic stated that the Old Fairground is a monument to the Serbian, Yugoslavian, worker’s spirit, entrepreneurship, industry, trade and creative potentials. He also represented it as a symbol of suffering, pain and destruction. He thought that the act of restoring the Fair would mean not only showing respect for the past and identity, but would also serve as a monument to our self-consciousness. Tatic was against restoration of the Fair in regards to the concentration camp, but thought that one pavilion should be changed into a museum. Regarding the state of existing pavilions, degree of how well preserved the previous plans and concepts of Europolis. Stepping out onto the banks, according to Tatic, opens up the possibility of creating several intricate complexes in the international open competition Europolis-Belgrade on the Sava River, intended to start in 1996. Therefore he began the discussion on this topic and called on all individuals and relevant institutions to give their point of view. His idea was supported by the Serbian Society of Art Historians.
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several ways. Some current values could be expressed through the reconstruction by having the pavilions employed as business space, spaces of cultural manifestations, museums, trade centers...

The Society of Art Historians of Serbia, which works on presenting and protecting the cultural heritage and heritage regarding paintings, used one of Tatic’s conclusions regarding the harmonious connectedness of the Old Fairground and the Museum of Modern Art as being a memorial whole of our modern artistic scene regarding paintings, as one of the means of giving support to his proposal of reconstructing the complex and for its further protection. They state that the art studios in pavilions and the museum could be, aside from being means of accessing art workshops and presenting contemporary culture, also incorporated into the future Europolis program as one of the famous places of the capital city’s cultural life, where modern art is created – which would also be offered in Belgrade’s tourism program.

Tatic’s proposal and the Society of Art Historians of Serbia’s support, was followed by a period of silence. With the arrival of the new century the Old Fairground – Gestapo Concentration Camp gains prominence again. In an attempt to keep it from being forgotten, from neglect and misuse, and in the main goal of raising the citizens’ awareness (about the onetime Belgrade Fair, about the victims and the suffering during the Second World War, the youth brigades which were stationed there while building Novi Beograd, and the idea of revitalizing the Old Fairground in the past several years more and more exhibits, panels, discussions, round tables are being held, and most participants have hopes that this will not be another case of “a lot of talk, with no action”.

General Plan of Belgrade 2021, 2003 and 2005

The basic starting point of the General Plan of Belgrade 2021 is an affirmation of urban continuity, during which the construction heritage is seen as a resources that has not been reused but is also a stimulant for development. “The Plan therefore protects and promotes cultural monuments, special cultural-historical wholes, archeological digs and important locations, natural cross-sections of the ground which has historically confirmed and esthetically Stätten mehrfach zu schätzen wüsste. Des weiteren erläutert Tatic, dass der Wiederaufbau aus einer Europolis immanenten Sicht auf unterschiedliche Weisen erfolgen könnte. Einige der aktuell Werte betonend könnten die Pavillons als Geschäftsräume, Kulturzentren, Museen, Handelszentren eingerichtet werden...


Generalplan Belgrads 2021, 2003, 2005

Ausgangspunkt des Generalplans Belgrads 2021 ist die Bejahung einer urbanen Kontinuität, im Laufe welcher das architektonische Erbe als nicht ersetzbare Ressource und Ansporn für weitere Entwicklung behandelt wird. „Somit werden im Rahmen des Plans Kulturdenkmäler, räumliche kulturgeschichtliche Einheiten, archäologische Fundstellen und sehenswerte Orte, natürliche Schnitstellen des Terrains mit integrierten, historisch

Износећи једну од констатација Дарка Татића која се односи на хармоничну повезаност Старог сајмишта и Музеја савремене уметности као својевршем споменичком целином наше савремене ликовне сцени, Друштво историчара уметности Србије, које се бави презентацијом и заштитом ликовног и културног наслеђа, уз све већ претходно наведено пружа подршку предлогу обнове комплекса и залага се за његово даље очување. Они износе да би атеље у павиљонима и Музеј могли бити, поред приступа уметничким радионицама и презентацији савремене уметности, утражени у програму будућег „Еурополиса“, као једно од култних места културног живота главног града, где се ствара савремена уметност, што би имало адекватну понуду и у туристичком програму Београда.

Након овог предлога и одговора Друштва историчара уметности Србије успели је период тишне. Доласком новог века Старо сајмиште-логор Гестапоа поново постаје актуелно. У тежњи да се отргне од заборава, немара и лошег коришћења са главним задачом буђења свести грађана (о ненадашњем комплексу Београдског сајмишта, о жртвама и страдању током Другог светског рата, насељу омладинских бригада током изградње Новог Београда и сликарској колонији) и идеји ревитализације Старог сајмишта задњих година се све чешће одржавају изложбе, трибине, дискусије, окруже столови за које се већина учесника нада да неће остати само речи без дела.


Основно полазиште Генералног плана Београда 2021. године је афирмација урбаног континуитета, током којег се градитељско наслеђе поставља као необновљени ресурс и стимуланс развоја. „Планом се зато штите и промовишу споменици уметности, просторне културно-историјске целине, археолошки налазишта и знаменита места, природни пресеки терена са историјским потврђеним и естетски вреднованим утраженим
New Initiatives from 2006 to 2008

In the National Museum as part of the "Old Fairground Days", in 2006, there was a panel discussion which aimed at having the wider public informed about the facts regarding the Old Fairground, pointing out the unfathomable devastation of this space and the danger of the complex's destruction, as well as making suggestions for how it may be reconstructed. A great number of different experts, during a long discussion, stated their opinions on existing relevant issues.

In regards to the revitalization of the Old Fairground the "Old Fairground – As a Cultural, Historic, Urban-Urbanological Resource With Great Industrial Potential" project must be mentioned; its first activities took place during the manifestation Central Celebration of European Heritage Day, which was held in Belgrade in September 2007. As part of this event the Urbanism Society of Belgrade and the Urbanism Institute of Belgrade gave mutual incentive to this manifestation with an exhibit which was held in the main hall of the Urbanism Institute. The project continued in 2008.

At the Architecture Expo in 2008 held in the Museum of Applied Art, the exhibit was enriched by new materials and accompanying program which not only stressed the importance of the Old Fairground but also the 60 years of Novi Beograd, whose nucleus (the old core of the new city) is the Old Fairground. As part of the project, the likes of which was presented at the 30th Architecture Expo, the leading roles were given to the young artists/students and their mentors who had. Through their work (plans, scenography, acting, photography, new architecture) at the "Old Fairground – Past/Present/Future" they tried to make the valued built in benchmarks, envisioned ideas and silhouettes, in the goal of preserving the spirit and character of urban spaces, permanently highlight and present all the valued elements of city structure and define the paths of establishing continuity with those aspects of the city that are still growing and being developed. The Old Belgrade Fair falls under the rules for "areas of complete reconstruction" which consists of "combined application of integrative conservation, urban reconstruction and special development, in accordance with the breadth and level of the heritage’s construction value".

Neue Initiativen zwischen 2006 und 2008

Im Jahr 2006 wurde im Nationaltheater im Rahmen der Veranstaltung „Tage des Staro Sajmište“ eine Tribüne abgehalten, deren Ziel es war, die breite Öffentlichkeit mit Tatsachen über Staro Sajmište vertraut zu machen, auf die kaum fassbare Verwahrlosung dieses Ortes und seine drohende Zerstörung hinzuweisen sowie Vorschläge zu Möglichkeiten eines Wiederaufbaus zu sammeln. In einer umfassenden Diskussion erläuterte eine ganze Reihe von Experten ihre Haltung gegenüber dieser Angelegenheit.


Beim Architektursalon 2008 im Museum für angewandte Kunst wurde die Ausstellung um neues Material und Begleitprogramme bereichert, welche nicht nur die Bedeutung von Staro Sajmište selbst hervorheben sollten, sondern auch das 60-jährige Jubiläum Neu-Belgrads, dessen Nukleus (alter Kern der neuen Stadt) gerade Staro Sajmište ist. Im Zusammenhang mit dem Projekt, welches beim 30. Architektursalon vorgestellt wurde, ist zu betonen, dass die Hauptakteure junge Künstler/Studierende und ihre Mentoren waren. In ihren Arbeiten (Pläne, Bühnenbild, Schauspiel, Fotografie, neue Architektur) versuchten sie im Rahmen der Leipziger, vizeum und siluetama, sa cijelom da se učuva duh i karakter urbane prostora, tajno naznac i prezentuju svi vrednovani elementi gradskih struktura i definiranu putevu uspostavljanja kontinuiteta sa onim aspektima gрада који даље расту и развијају се“. Staro beogradsko sajmište поднео правилма за “подручја опште обнове” под којом се подразумева „комбинована примена интегративне конзервације, урbane обнове и уређења простора, усаглашена према обиму и нивоу вредности градитељског наслеђа“.

Године 2006. у Народном музеју у оквиру манифестације „Дани Старог сајмишта“ одржана је трибина са циљем да се шира јавност упозна са чињеницама о Старом сајмишту, да се укаже на несвртнућу девастирацију овога места и опасност од уништења комплекса, као и да се изнесу предлози о начинима његове обнове. У општрој дискусiji, велики броj различитих стручњака изнео je своje виђење о наведеним питањима.

У циљу ревитализације Старог сајмишта треба потенцијал и пројекат „Старо београдско сајмиште—као културни, историјски, урбанистичко-урбанолошки ресурс са великим привредним потенцијалом“ чије су прве активности почеле током манифестације Централне прославе дана европске баштине која се одржала у Београду септембра 2007. године. У оквиру овог догађаја Друштво урбаниста Београда и Урбанистички завод Београда су зајединчили дали подстицај овој манифестацији изложбом која је била постављена у главном холу Урбанистичког завода. Пројекат се проширио и на текућу годину.

На Салону архитектуре 2008. године у Музеју примењене уметности, изложба је обогаћена новим материјалом и пратећим програмом који нису истицали значај само Старог сајмишта него и 60 година Новог Београда, чији је нуклеус (Старо језгро новог града) Старо сајмиште. У склопу пројекта какав је представљен на 30 салону архитектуре треба истицати да су главне угле имали млади уметници/студенти и њихови ментори. Својим радовома (планови, ценифографија, слика, фотографија, нова архитектура) они су покушали да кроз изложбу Старо сајмиште прошири/садашњост/будућност
During the Architecture Expo a round table also took place – on the topic of the Old Fairground development. Aside from existing fears that the complex may end up being owned by some investor if something is not done soon, it was stated that there is no consensus over its future purpose even though the urban plan shows that the structures will be reconstructed. It was also suggested that the best solution would be forming a company which would regulate this question and all accompanying problems which would be posed by reconstruction of the Old Fairground – and this relates also to the people who live there, where they would be moved to and how many new structures would be built.

At the beginning of May 2009, during the Belgrade Design Week, a discussion was held about the necessity of building a memorial center at the place where the Old Fairground concentration camp used to be. One of the participants, architect Danijel Libeskind, who designed the Jewish memorial centers in Berlin and Copenhagen, stressed the role of architectural memorials in reminding people about injustices. He stressed the need to acknowledge the past and that people must be made aware of what had happened and what the repercussions of these events were. He believes that the complex's future survival is in educational purposes; Fond B92 supports this idea and hopes that an educational center will be established and will, drawing on the existing heritage, teach tolerance and living together in peace. During the discussion criticism could be heard regarding the business dealings of the “Poseidon” company – which has owned the space of former Spasić pavilion since 1998 and rents the space for various sports events, concerts and other events.

When it comes to what is going on regarding the reconstruction of the Old Fairground complex it must be said that in the period from 2005 to 2007 it was the subject of research of two concept projects which aimed at some sort of rehabilitation sidestepping...

Im Rahmen des Architektursalons fand auch eine Diskussion rund um das Thema der Einteilung des Komplexes am alten Messegelände statt. Neben der Angst, das Gelände könnte, falls nicht schnell etwas unternommen wird, in die Hände eines Anlegers gelangen, wurde festgestellt, dass kein Konsens über seinen künftigen Zweck bestünde, obwohl laut urbanistischem Plan vorgesehen sei, die Bauten zu rekonstruieren. Des Weiteren wurde vorgeschlagen, ein Unternehmen zu gründen, welches sich aus der Vergangenheit und allen auftretenden Schwierigkeiten beim Wiederaufbau des alten Messegeländes (worum auch auch die Frage, wohin die Menschen, die dort leben, ausgesiedelt werden sollten, soweit die Zahl der neuen Bauten zu verstehen ist) auseinander setzen würde.

Im Rahmen der Belgrader Designwoche Anfang Mai 2009 wurde eine Debatté über die erforderliche Einrichtung einer Gedenkstätte am Standort des einstigen Lagers Staro Sajmištè veranstaltet. Einer der Teilnehmer, Architekt Daniel Libeskind, welcher die jüdischen Gedenkzentren in Berlin und Copenhagen entwarf, betonte die Rolle von architektonischen Denkmälern für die Bewusstmachung von Greueltagen. Er hör hoffentlich, dass der Besuch von der Vergangenheit anerkennen und Menschen die damaligen Ereignisse und deren Folgen vor Augen führen. Seiner Meinung nach lagen die Zukunft des Komplexes in seiner didaktischen Zweck, was auch der Fonds B92 mit dem Wunsch, ein Bildungszentrum einrichten zu wollen, wo aufgrund von vorhandenem Erbe Toleranz und Zusammenleben gelehrt werden würden, unterstützt. Im Laufe der Diskussion wurden auch Kritiken an der Vorgehensweise des Unternehmens „Poseydon“ lautbar, das seit 1998 Eigentümer des Grundstücks, auf welchem sich einst der Spasić-Pavillon befand, ist und im Rahmen seiner Geschäfte den Raum auch für diverse Sportveranstaltungen, Konzerte und sonstige Programme vermietet.

Was die Maßnahmen zum Wiederaufbau des Komplexes am alten Messegelände anbelangt ist zu nennen, dass in der Zeit zwischen 2005 und 2007 Ausforschungen im Rahmen zweier Projektconzepte für eine Art von Wiederaufbau außerhalb der...
the existing institutions. One was part of the Feasibility Study on conversion of the urban settlement for the needs of Belgrade’s creative sector, as part of the SAIT (Social Actors in Transformation) Belgrade project, as part of the international team CHOROS International Projects, New York. The other concept dealt with the application of the IDEAS program, as part of the UNOPS program. Applying the experiences of revitalizing Havana’s historic center (and social program at the same time), this concept was deemed irrational since ownership would not be clear, expenses of relocating the families that live there today and the artists’ studios would be too high, and also the managing rights over the complex would not be clear either.

4. THE OLD FAIRGROUND TODAY

4.1. State of the Physical Structures

4.1.1. Structures

Today’s structures which are in the Old Fairground can be divided into three groups in regards to the time they were constructed:

- structures built by 1939
- structures built between 1945 – 1950
- structures built after 1950

Structures built by 1939

1. The Central Tower (Old Fairground no. 3, cadastre property - c.p. 2360) – built in 1937 according to Aleksandar Sekulic’s project. It has exceptional architectural value and is the recognizable symbol of the complex. It consists of a two-story base on a round foundation and a tower. The structure is 40 meters high. It was originally intended for exhibitions and business space, while during the time of the Nazi concentration camp it housed part of the camp’s directorate.

Urbanism Institute – IONO, reached a decision in 1952 the Tower was given over to artists (painters, sculptors) to be used for artists’ studios, and today it is used for living quarters.

The central tower has been preserved though it has changed – aside from the renovations and adaptations done in the fifties, the existing institutions due to the housing needs of Belgrade’s creative sector, as part of the SAIT (Social Actors in Transformation) Belgrade project, as part of the international team CHOROS International Projects, New York. The other concept dealt with the application of the IDEAS program, as part of the UNOPS program. Applying the experiences of revitalizing Havana’s historic center (and social program at the same time), this concept was deemed irrational since ownership would not be clear, expenses of relocating the families that live there today and the artists’ studios would be too high, and also the managing rights over the complex would not be clear either.

4. STARO SAJMIŠTE DANAS

4.1. Сајмиште данас

4.1.1. Објекти

Данас је грађевински фонд у оквиру комплекса Старо сајмиште може се поделити у три групе обзиром на времена изградње:

- Објекти настали до 1939. године
- Објекти настали у периоду 1945-50. године
- Објекти настали после 1950. године

Објекти настали до 1939. године

1. Централна кула (Старо сајмиште бр.3, к.п.2360) - изграђена је 1937. године по пројекту Александра Секулца. Туров је значајан посебан архитектонски софисциран Бауз са кружном фундаментом и два спратна простора. Изграђена је као изложбени простор, а у време НДХ-логора је служила као седиште управе логора.
A static sanitation project for the structure must momentarily be made. It is also necessary to examine the state of all installations, as well as to ascertain if there is a problem with dampness. After decision have been reached on the future purpose of the structures it is necessary to make a Reconstruction, Adaptation and Revitalization Project, which would have as an integral part restoration and conservation.

2. Directorate building (Old Fairground, no. 29, c.p. 2341/9) – built in 1937, according to Aleksandar Sekulic’s project. It is a smaller structure with a dominant RIZALIT (ngde nisam nashla prevod ni objashnjenje ovog pojma), built in a half circle, on the main part of the exterior. The first purpose was administrative, while during the Nazi concentration camp it was part of the camp Directorate.

The structure has been maintained to this day, with some changes and additions. The building is used for office space of the English Book company, which owns it.

Considering that the archival plans are still in existence it is still possible to make a conservation-restoration project, as well as a project for reconstruction and revitalization.

3. Spasic’s pavilion (Old Fairground, no. 20, c.p. 2354) built in 1937 according to Aleksandar Sekulic’s project. It was designed as a structure with an elliptical base with an accented entrance annex of a rectangular base. It spans 1320 square meters. In regards to its architectural characteristics the pavilion represents an important example of the high modernist architecture, characteristic for Belgrade’s architecture during the last decade before the war. During the Second World War the camp's hospital was located there.

During the post-war period Spasic’s pavilion, on Old Fairground no. 20, had different uses. During the fifties its premises were by the Directorate for the Development of Novi Beograd, as well as the High-school for Architecture. The pavilion’s hall was well suited for the needs of the school's physical education. During the seventies the Institute for Development of Belgrade vergangene Jahrhunderts erfolgten, sind am Objekt neuere Eingriffe an Holzlelementen der Fassade sowie neu geschaffene Türen und Fenster zu erkennen (das Objekt wird als Wohnhaus genutzt). Der Allgemeinzustand des Gebäudes ist sehr schlecht, besonders besorgniserregend sind die deutschen Beschädigungen der Stahlbetonpfeiler am Turm.


Da Archivpläne vorhanden sind, ist es möglich, ein Projekt zur Konservierung und Restaurierung sowie eines zu Rekonstruktion und Revitalisierung zu erstellen.


In der Nachkriegszeit diente der Spasic-Pavillon (Staro sajmište 20) unterschiedlichen Zwecken. Während der 50-er Jahre des 20. Jahrhunderts nutzten die Baudirektion für Neu-Belgrad und die Berufsschule für Bauwesen diese Räume. Der Pavillonsaal diente als Turnhalle der Schule. In den 70-er Jahren des 20. Jahrhundert wurde die Bauanstalt der Sadt Belgrad als Eigentümer dieses Gr-

Потребно је хитно сачувати пројекат статичке санације објекта. Такође је потребно испитати стање свих инсталација, као и да ли постоје проблеми са влагом. После доношења одлука о будућој намени објекта, треба сачинити Пројекат реконструкције, адаптације и ревитализације, чији би саставни део био и културно-ретараторски пројекат.

2. Управна зграда (Старо сајмиште бр.29, к.п.2341/9) - изграђена је 1937. године по пројекту Александра Секулића. То је мањи објекат са доминирајућим полукружним ризалитом на главној фасади. Приватна намена била је административна, а за време нацистичког логора -део управе логора.

Објекат је сачуван са изменама и дограђен. Зграда се користи као пословни простор предузећа „English books“, у чијој је својини.

Обзиром да постоје архивски планови, могућа је израда културно-ретараторског пројекта, као и пројекта реконструкције и ревитализације.

3. Спасићев павиљон (Старо сајмиште бр.20, к.п.2354) саграђен је 1937. године према пројекту Александра Секулића. Пројектован је као објекат елипсасте основе са наглашеним узгајним анексом правогуловне основе, укупне површине 1320 m². По својим архитектонским карактеристикама павиљон представља значајан пример архитектуре високе модерне, карактеристичне за последњу предратну деценију у градињству Београда. У току Другог светског рата у њему је била логорска болница.

У последњем периоду Спасићев павиљон, Старо сајмиште 20 имао је различите намене. Његове просторије током педесетих година двадесетог века, користила је Дирекција за изградњу Новог Београда као и Средња грађевинска школа. Сала павиљона одговарала је потребама фискултурне наставе школе. Током 70-их година двадесетог века Завод за изградњу
was written in as the owner of this space. In 1998 the Poseidon Company buys the structure from the previous owner. In the pavilion's entrance hall Poseidon's tourist agency is located. The main hall is on the ground floor, it serves multimedia purposes (exhibits, concerts, theatre...). On the floor above there is a gallery which is used for exhibits, a café and hall used by a dance school.

The Republic Public Ombudsperson's Office had started proceedings at court, in order to annul the contract on Poseidon's purchase of Spasic's pavilion. According to our findings this proceeding has not yet been finished. Considering that ownership over this structure is uncertain its usage has been minimal. There are not many adequate forms of usage considering the cultural-historical and memorial aspects of this structure. Due to inadequate maintenance the structure is in permanent state of decay.

Considering that the archival plans are still in existence it is still possible to make a conservation-restoration project, as well as a project for reconstruction and revitalization.

4. Italian pavilion (Old Fairground, no. 28, c.p. 2356) – the project was authored by Dante Petroni, a professor at the University of Florence, and built in 1937. The basic purpose it was intended for was to serve as a fair exhibition pavilion. During the Second World War it was kept as part of the Nazi camp, as a food storage space and carpenter workshop.

By IONO's decision in 1952 this space was given over to artists (painters, sculptors) for art studios, while today it is also used as storage space and carpenter workshop.

The pavilion has been preserved, through minor interventions, and is currently in a bad state due to long-term neglect.

Considering that the archival plans are still in existence it is still possible to make a conservation-restoration project, as well as a project for reconstruction and revitalization.

5. Czechoslovakian pavilion (Old Fairground, no. 21, c.p. 2357) – authored by Vaclav Gisa, an accredited architect from Prague. It was built in 1937, and its main purpose was to serve as undesticks eingetragen. Im Jahr 1998 übernimmt das Unternehm „Poseydon GmbH“ das Objekt vom vorherigen Eigentümer. In der Eingangshalle des Pavillons befindet sich heute das Reisebüro „Poseydon“. Der Hauptsaal im Erdgeschoss ist multimedial ausgerichtet und wird für Ausstellungen, Konzerte und Vorstellungen eingesetzt. Im Obergeschoss befindet sich, neben einem Ausstellungsraum und eines Cafés, auch ein Saal, welcher von einer Tänzschule beansprucht wird.


Da Archivpläne vorhanden sind, besteht sie Möglichkeit, ein Projekt zu Konservierung und Restaurierung sowie eines zu Rekonstruktion und Revitalisierung zu erstellen.

4. Italienischer Pavillon (Staro Sajmište 28, KP 2356) – Autor dieses Projekts ist Dante Petroni, Dozent an der Universität in Florenz; das Objekt wurde 1937 errichtet. Ursprünglich war das Objekt als Ausstellungsraum konzipiert, um im Zweiten Weltkrieg als Bestandteil des KZ-Lagers als Vorratskammer und Tischlerwerkstatt eingesetzt zu werden.

Mit Beschluss der Exekutive im Volksausschuss wurde er 1952 Künstlern (Malern und Bildhauern) als Atelier zur Verfügung gestellt; heute dient er als Wohnobjekt.

Der Pavillon ist, mit wenigen Eingriffen, erhalten, befindet sich jedoch wegen jahrelangem Mangel an Instandhaltung in ausgesprochen schlechtem Zustand.

Da Archivpläne des Italienischen Pavillons aus der Zeit der Baudirektion für Neu-Belgrad (als Konzept zum Umbau in ein Planungsbüro) bewahrt sind, besteht die Möglichkeit, ein Projekt zu Konservierung und Restaurierung sowie eines zu Rekonstruktion und Revitalisierung zu erstellen.

4. Italienski paviljon (Staro sajmište br.28, k.p.2356) - autor projekta je Dante Petroni, profesor Univerziteta u Firence, a objekt je izgrađen 1937. godine. Osnovna namena bila je sajamski izložbeni prostor, a za vrijeme Drugog svetskog rata bio je u sklopu nacističkog logora - mackoću i stolarsku radionicu.

Odumak IONO-a 1952. godine dodeljen je umetnicima (slika) za potrebe aterija, a danas se koristi i za stanovanje.

Paviłjon je sačuvan, sa manjim intervencijama, i nalazi se u losec stanu usled višegodišnjeg neodržavanja.

Obzirom da su sačuvani arhivski planovi Spasićevog paviliona, moguća je izrada konzervatorsko-restauratorskog projekta, kao i projekta rekonstrukcije i revitalizacije.

5. Tschecoslovakischer Pavillon (Staro Sajmište 21, KP 2357) – Autor des Projektes ist Waclaw Gisa, beauftragter Architekt aus Prag; das Objekt wurde 1937 errichtet. Grundsätzlich war es als
Structures built between 1945 and 1950

In the period from 1945 to 1950 several structures were built which were located where the Yugoslavian pavilions once were. They are ground floor structures, mostly sheds, which were built for the youth brigade's stay while they worked on building Novi Beograd. In the vicinity of the Central Tower a one story structure was built then – workers' housing, large in scale; it undermines the ambient of the complex's central part.

All structures are in a bad state; in ruin. The living standard there is on a very low level.

Zwischen 1945 und 1950 entstandene Bauten


Alle diese Bauten befinden sich in sehr schlechtem Zustand. Der Lebensstandard in ihnen ist extrem niedri
4.1.2 Memorials

At the location of the Old Fairground there are two memorials today: the Monument to the Victims of Genocide (1995) and the Memorial Plaque Dedicated to the Victims of the Old Fairground Concentration Camp (1984).

Unfortunately, both memorials are frequently damaged. An adequate memorial plaque, located at the steps which lead to the monument from the Sava promenade, is frequently damaged by hoodlums. The bordering elements around the monument are also frequently damaged, and there is no constant and organized way of keeping maintenance of the memorials.

4.1.3 Open public spaces

The Project of an urban solution for the First Phase of the Old Fairground construction was done in 1937 by architects Milivoj Trčković, Rajko Tatić and Djordje Lukić. It was completely realized, except for the river bank development and a restaurant that housed the Leather-Tanning School was built with accompanying structures. The structure is only ground level and is not sound.

4.1.2. Denkmäler


Auch das zweite Denkmal, die Gedenktafel von 1984, befindet sich in ähnlichem Zustand - die beschriebene Granittafel weist Bruchstellen auf, während der Zugang verwahrlost und ungepflegt ist.

4.1.3. Offener öffentlicher Raum

Das urbanistische Projekt für die erste Phase in der Einrichtung der alten Messe 1937 stammt von den Architekten Milivoj Trčković, Rajko Tatić und Dorde Lukić. Das Projekt wurde zur Gänze umgesetzt, abgesehen von der Einrichtung des Flussufers und eines Restaurants.

Der Plan für die Einrichtung der Parkanlage und seine Umsetzung erfolgten unter Aufsicht von Ingenieur Aleksandar Krstić,
The fair complex was trapezoid in shape and fenced. It had two entrances on the north side – coming from the north-west and the north-east, from the King Aleksandar Bridge. The entrances to the complex were made up of two symmetrical structures (ticket sale booths), located to the left and right of the main gate.

The whole complex was made more appealing by adequate ground floor structure placement. The solution for the park consisted of a circular pathway, like a ring, which encompassed the space where the centrally located structures were placed. On the other side of the main pathway private pavilions were located. North of the main pathway, to the left and right of Spasic's pavilion, were two winding paths. On the main path two circular RUNDELA (nisam nasla ni jedan prevod ove reči, niti objašnjenje pojma) were located, with paths approaching them which lead to the complex's entrances. The trapezoid shape of the complex made intrusions from the corners to the center possible.

The areas surrounding the central tower was regulated in a special way by a system of eight five-sided flower beds, while the central square got the dominant role in this space. The ground floor spaces between the pavilions were regulated so as to have small flower beds, lawns, pathways and fountains.

An expansion to the West and building of the German and the sixth Yugoslav pavilion was planned in the second phase of the Old Fairground construction.

The complex was downsized by the construction of a new road and newly built Sava Bridge. Its image degraded even more by the damages in 1944 and later with shacks that were built in 1950 when the complex was turned into a place of social housing. In the northern part of the complex, along with buildings that are almost all ruined, also contributes to this image. The former park spaces in time developed into shrubs. The space around the central tower is particularly devastated. Besides the

Im Raum um den zentralen Turm waren eigens acht fünfeckige Grünanlagen eingerichtet, während der zentrale Platz über den Komplex dominierte. Die Flächengestaltung zwischen den Pavillons umfasste kleinere Grünanlagen, Wiesen, Pfanzen und Brunnen.

Die zweite Phase beim Bau der alten Messe sah eine Ausweitung in Richtung Westen vor sowie die Errichtung des Deutschen Pavillons und des Sechsten jugoslawischen Pavillons.


Insgesamt befindet sich der Komplex des alten Messegeländes heute in ausgesprochen schlechtem Zustand. Neben den Bauten, von denen fast alle ruiniert sind, trägt auch die Verwahrlosung der Grünanlagen zu diesem Bild bei. Das ganze Gelände inklusive der Freilufteinrichtungen war sich selbst überlassen und verfiel zwangläufig, sodass Teile der einstigen Parkanlagen mit der Zeit
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...
Part of the complex near the embankment today is occupied by sports court fields. The football club “Brodarac” has occupied the former playground designed for brigadiers, and it occupied part of the space of the closed sports field (balloon) as well. Dimensions, volume and purpose of this court decrease the value of this space.

The whole “Old Fairground” complex requires more radical measures of reconstruction and revitalization by the park regulation.

The river bank zone is leaning up to the Old Fairground complex. The river bank zone of the Belgrade “Old Fairground” consists of the area between the Sava regulation line and the old coastal road, that is, the old embankment. The path and stairway descent connects it with the fairground complex but with its purpose it is specially arranged and an independent public river bank space.

The main purpose of the river bank zone on the Novi Beograd side was recreation and rest. The river bank zone of the “Old Fairground” was arranged in 1944, before the commemorative plaques were placed. It’s a green belt with beautiful trails in the river bank area directly above the bank revetment and laid out ground floor of the memorial space. The project was planned by architect Brana Mitrović in cooperation with architect Djojde Bobić (Slavia Bureau). The micro location of the monuments and river bank arrangement between the two bridges mark the introduction to the historical fairground space. It can be seen from the right river bank and keeps a dominant position and vista between the two bridges. This space, as part of entire river bank zone participates in forming the city landscape.

The river bank area occupies part of the river's flow. On the river, on the “Old Fairground” river bank zone, vessels were placed: restaurant-discotcheque and few minor structures. Their location here is inadequate and unacceptable.
4.2 PURPOSE AND USAGE

4.2.1 Terrain

The memorial complex of the “Old Fairground” is separated by the Satio Sajmište Street in two different parts in terms of purpose and use of the terrain.

The Western part has a high level of purpose homogeneity – businesses and services in the area of industrial and individual transportation. There is a large number of car services, car showrooms, agencies of vehicle manufacturers, etc. in this zone. Land usage is intensive during working hours but after that all the activities come to an end. The Eastern part doesn’t have a homogenous character, but usage for low standard housing (collective and individual) prevails.

Aside from housing, land is used for education (School for Leather-Tanning), sport (football court), business (Spasic pavilion—“Poseidon d.o.o.”), services (tire repairman’s service in the Hungarian pavilion), collection of secondary raw materials in the backyards of few objects, a bakery in a temporary object near the Central tower and catering (in the Turkish pavilion). The space between the old embankment and the Sava bank belongs to the continuous promenade along the Sava River bank on the Novi Beograd side.

4.2.2 Buildings

Housing Purpose—On the area of the former Yugoslav pavilions 1 and 2, after the Second World War, four shacks were built for the youth brigades stay (Old Fairground 4,5,7 and 8). Today, they are used for housing. The Satio Sajmište Street in two different parts in terms of purpose and use of the terrain.

These housing objects don’t satisfy standards of decent housing regarding constructional characteristics and infrastructural equipment. The central tower, Italian and Czechoslovakian pavilions, in 1952, were assigned to the Association of Fine Artists of Serbia regarding constructional characteristics and infrastructural equipment. These housing objects don’t satisfy standards of decent housing. The central tower, Italian and Czechoslovakian pavilions, in 1952, were assigned to the Association of Fine Artists of Serbia regarding constructional characteristics and infrastructural equipment. These housing objects don’t satisfy standards of decent housing.

4.2. ZWECK UND NUTZUNG

4.2.1. Grundstück

Die Gedenkstätte Staro Sajmište ist durch die Staro-Sajmište-Straße in zwei hinsichtlich Zweck und Nutzung unterschiedliche Teile gespalten.


4.2.2. Gebäude


4.2. НАМЕНЕ И НАЧИН КОРИШЋЕЊА

4.2.1. Земљиште

Споменчки комплекс Старог сајмишта подељен је уликом Стак сајмишта на два, у погледу намене и начина коришћења земљишта, различита дела.

Западни део има висок ниво хомогености намена - пословне и услуге у области индустријског и појединачног транспорта. У овој „зони” смештен је велики број ауто-сервиса, проодајних салаун аутомобила, заступништава произвођача превозних средстава... итд. Коришћење земљишта је интензивно у току радног времена, а после тога активности у простору замиру. Источни део нема хомоген карактер, али преовлађујућа је намена становања (и колективног и индивидуалног) ниског стандарда.

Поред станишта, земљиште се користи и за образовање (Средња кожарска школа), спорт (фудбалски терен и „балон”), пословне (Спаци павиљон – „Poseydon d.o.o.”), услуге (вукуланизерска радница у Мађарском павиљону, прикупљање секундарних сировина у двориштима неколико објеката, пекара у привременом објекту близу Централне куле) и употреба... итд. Коришћење земљишта је интензивно у току радног времена, а после тога активности у простору замиру. Источни део нема хомоген карактер, али преовлађујућа је намена становања (и колективног и индивидуалног) ниског стандарда.

Град Београд — Завод за споменичке културе
Business purposes - A match for the pavilion 1 and 2 at the address Staro Sajmište 29, there were the Yugoslav pavilions 4 and 5. A Renault's business complex that includes a showroom, service center, space where annual car check-ups are done and a spare parts store, is built on the foundation of those pavilions. Further down the street, towards Branko's Bridge, on the same address there was an administrative building during the war command of the concentration camp, but today it is used for business. The publishing house “The English Book” has been in the offices in the building since the 2003. Besides already mentioned housing buildings, there is also a tavern “Brodarac” on the address of Staro Sajmište 6. To the side, towards Sava there is football courtyard called “Brodarac”.

Company “Poseidon d.o.o” has its disposal the Spasic pavilion. The purpose of the main hall on the ground floor is multi medial (for exhibitions, concerts, theater shows). On the floor, there is, besides a gallery that has exhibition function and also serves as café-bar, also a hall that a dance school is using. In it management, company “Poseidon d.o.o” represents itself as ArtExpo/INFOEDUCENTAR of the fine arts, design and trades and its program is shown on website www.pavilion.or

Educational purpose - The Leather-Tanning School along with a courtyard and additional buildings for practical teaching is on the address Staro Sajmište 1, where there was once the biggest Fair pavilion - the former Yugoslav pavilion 3.

4.3. LEGAL PROPERTY ISSUES

4.3.1. Property and Right of Usage of the Land

Based on the data from the Republic Geodetic Office - Cadastre Service of Novi Beograd it is stated that the entire area is considered a cultural good, and is in the state's property sphere, while those who have the right to use the land are numerous (from Republic of Serbia, city of Belgrade, municipality of Novi Beograd, to public communal companies, public and private firms, and even individuals).

4.3. EIGENTUMSRECHTLICHE LAGE

4.3.1. Eigentum und Nutzungsrecht über die Grundstücke


Пословна намена - Као пандан павиљонима 1 и 2, на данашњој адреси Старо сајмиште 29, налазили су се југословенски павиљони 4 и 5. На њиховим темељима подигнут је Реноов пословни комплекс који садржи продавни салон, сервис, простор за технички преглед и продавнице резервних делова. У продужетку улице, према Бранковом мосту, на истој адреси, некада се налазила зграда Управе сајма, током времена лагеркомандно војних команда, а данас је у намени пословања. Побудник зграде од 2003. године користи издавачка кућа „The English Book”. На адреси Старо сајмиште бр.6, поред већ споменутих стамбених објеката издавају се и кафана „Бродарц”. На страни према Сави налази се фудбалско игралиште „Бродарц”.

Предузмење „Poseydon d.o.o.” располаже Спасићевим павиљонима. У улазном холу данас се налазе просторије које је уз значају послуге „Град Бања Лука” један од највећих Луксуских покрета, а потом и кафана „Бродарс”. На страни према Сави налази се фудбалско игралиште „Бродарц”.

Образовна намена - На адреси Старо сајмиште 1, простору некадашњег Југословенског павиљона 3, који је био највећи сајамски павиљон, данас се налази Кожарска школа са пратећим објектом за практичну наставу и двориштем.

4.3. ИМОВИНСКО-ПРАВНА ПИТАЊА

4.3.1. Власништво и право коришћења земљишта

На основу података прикупљених од Републичког геодетског завода - Службе за катастар Нови Београд, констатовано је да је свој земљиште обухватао границама културног добра у државној својини, док су бројни носиоци права коришћења на земљишту (од Републике Србије, Града Београда и ГО Нови Београд до јавних комunalних предузећа, друштвених и приватних предузећа, па чак и физичких лица).
4.3.2 Property and Right of Usage of Buildings

While all of the "Old Fairground" complex land is in state property, a form of property when it comes to buildings is not defined ("other forms of property", "mixed property") and also there is a large number of buildings that are still public property. Obviously, legal property rights should be questioned for each individual case. A significant number of buildings is listed in the real estate cadastre as "buildings built without permit". These buildings are not coherent with memorial characteristics of cultural goods and they should be removed if conditions for conducting technical protection of cultural monuments can be achieved.

There are cases that in the real estate cadastre ownership of the apartments or business spaces is written as private - in buildings that are built without a construction permit (ex. The building located on the address Staro Sajmište 23, c.p.2353). Although the data received from the real estate cadastre shows that there is a relatively small number of private apartments, it can be presumed that there are de facto more of them. These apartments are mostly in former shacks and warehouse buildings mentioned in the previous section of the document.

Collected data that concerns the form of land ownership and building ownership is shown on following chart and table.

4.4. Conclusions – Problem Identification

In reviewing the current state of cultural goods the following problems are observed.

1. "Complex" Non-Existence

In the papers written by professionals from different fields, the term "Old Fairground" always concerns an area consisting of the old fair complex or of the concentration camp. That also happened while establishing the cultural good "Old Fairground—Gestapo Concentration Camp". However, objectively speaking, today the complex is not at all recognizable in space. Except for the name "Old Fairground" which is mostly concerns the space between the two bridges and the Staro Sajmište Street, and general neg-

4.3.2. Eigentum und Nutzungsrecht über die Bauten


Die recherchierten Daten betreffend egentumsrechtliche Verhältnisse über Grundstück und Bauobjekte sind wie folgt graf- phisch und tabellarisch dargestellt.

4.4. Schlussfolgerung – Problemfeststellung

Den heutigen Zustand des Kulturguts „Gestapolager Staro Sajmište“ ins Auge fassend, sind folgenden Probleme zu erkennen:

1. „Komplex” nicht vorhanden


4.4. Заключец – идентификация проблем

Сагледавањем данашњег стана културног добра Старо сајмиште-Логор Гестапо уочавају се следећи проблеми:

1. Непостојање „комплекса”

Појам „Старо сајмиште“ у стручним радовима из различитих области односи се увек на просторни овај комплекс некадашњег сајма или логора. Тako је било и приликом утврђивања за културно добро „Старо сајмиште-Логор Гестапо“. Међутим, данас се објективно комплекс уопште не препознаје у простору. Осим назва „Старо сајмиште” који се најчешће односи на простор између два моста и улице Сајмиште и опште запушености, нема никаквих повезујућих
2. Inadequate Property and Land and Building Usage

All terrain which is considered to be a cultural good is owned by the state and has the character of the city's building plot. However, the parceling is very fragmented, and possessors and holders of the right of using are many (from the Republic of Serbia, City of Belgrade, Municipality of Novi Beograd to public communal firms, public and private companies, and even individuals).

State property should be kept as such, and conversion to private shouldn't be allowed. There is a similar situation with owners and holders of the rights on buildings- according to the data from the Republic Geodetic Office, buildings are in state, public, private, mixed and other forms of property. In regards to the way they are used, buildings can be sorted as: family buildings for housing, buildings for industrial transport, additional buildings, cultural buildings, educational buildings, health care services buildings and buildings for infrastructure and buildings whose purpose isn't specified.

This kind of heterogeneity when it comes to the type of property, forms of property and ways of use, points to the spontaneous character of the urban development and lack of existence of any kind of city's strategy towards this area. There is also a large number of buildings stated in the real estate cadastre as "Buildings Built Without Permits for Construction". It's expected that the owners of these buildings have already started the process of legalization. These buildings should get particular attention while some of them have a complex building use and should get particular attention. It's expected that the owners of these buildings have already started the process of legalization.

2. Inadäquate Eigentumsverhältnisse und Nutzung von Gelände und Objekten


Wie das alte Messegelände heute kein Komplex im physikalischen Sinn ist, ist es das aus administrativer Sicht genauso weni Sollte die Entscheidung getroffen werden, einen Gedenk- komplex als neue Ansatz mit klarer Funktion und eindeutig definierter Fläche einzurichten, wäre einer der Zuständigkeits- und Verantwortungsbereiche die Verwaltung über das Gelände (Grundstück und Bauten).

Поред тога што Старо сајмиште данас нема својства комплекса у физичком, нема га ни у административном смислу. Уколико се донесе одлука у правцу успостављања Меморијалног комплекса као нове, јасно профилисана институције која има јасан просторни обухват, једна од његових надлежности и одговорности мора бити и управљање простором (земљиштем и објектима).

Оваква хетерогеност у врсти власништва, облицима својине и начинима коришћења указује на спонтани карактер урбаног развоја и непостојање биолошке стратегије Града (Државе) према овоме простору. Велики је и број објеката уписанних у Катастар непокретности који су означени као „објекти израђени без одобрења за изградњу”. За очекивати је да су власници ових објеката покренули поступак легализације код надлежних служби. Приликом спровођења поступка
Not conducted the legalisation process.

3. Neglect of Maintenance

Current building owners or those who are using them don’t have an interest or capacity for quality preservation of these buildings. And they don’t have any responsibility for that either. The current maintenance of public spaces is also very dissatisfying (uncontrolled vegetation growth, accumulated dirt, retention of standing water). Institutions in charge would have to improve their activities in the Old Fairground.

4. Inadequate Purposes

Most of today’s purposes of the terrain and buildings are inadequate in regards to it being a cultural good. Particularly purposes like catering and fun and even sports are conflicted with the memorial significance and values of the Memorial of the Old Fairground. Substandard housing and confusing spatial organization of business content in the Western part of the complex is nothing less inappropriate.

5. Poor Condition of Buildings Which Have Memorial Characteristics

Buildings that were preserved from the period of the First Belgrade Fair construction have to be permanently saved for their cultural-historical and architectural-urban values. They are in pretty bad condition. The central tower building is especially threatened and it’s in urgent need of appropriate repair. Due to many years of neglect and lack of maintenance permanent degradation of original building materials, falling parts of the façade and appearance of cracks comes about. These buildings are have been devastated by the many adaptations, remodeling, applying inadequate materials, inadequate replacement of façade elements (carpentry, hardware), etc. Damages of the roof and roof covers lead to further damage because of the water and humidity in the atmosphere. The conditions of all these facilities should be recorded in full detail and projects for their reconstruction and revitalization need to be prepared in accordance with the future purpose within Memorial Complex.

6. Traffic and infrastructure

Existing transport and traffic levels in the Staro Sajmište Street do not provide adequate conditions for it being presented as a cultural eingeleitet haben. Diesen Bauten sollte im Zug einer eventuellen Legalisierung besonderes Augenmerk gewidmet werden.

3. Mangel an Instandhaltung


4. Inadäquater Zweck


5. Schlechter Zustand der Gebäude mit Denkmalwert


6. Verkehr und Infrastruktur

Das aktuelle Verkehrskonzept und die Verkehrsentlastung in der Staro-Sajmište-Straße bieten nicht die notwendigen Vorausset-
Reaffirming previous urbanism concepts of the Old Fairground, Staro sajmište Street should have a solely internal character, which demands a new traffic solution in the wider area around the location. According to our knowledge reconstruction of all existing infrastructural systems is also necessary.

5. CONCEPT FORMATION FOR THE MEMORIAL COMPLEX “OLD FAIRGROUND”

In the previous section of this document it was stated a couple of times that without a doubt the most important historical value of the Old Fairground is in its role of a killing-field in the Second World War. Therefore, a memorial complex should be the main and only purpose of this complex, and it should integrate three primary components in a completely modern way: education, science and culture.

Concept of Spatial Planning

As mentioned above, buildings of the former concentration camp (and the First Belgrade Fair) have not been saved in authentic condition. Therefore, the presentation of this cultural good cannot be based on the model of the Auswitz-Birkenau Memorial zungen for a corresponding Präsentation des Kulturguts. Obwohl zwischen zwei Brücken gelegen, welche Neu-Belgrad mit dem alten Teil der Stadt verbinden, ist das alte Messegelände schwer zugänglich und unzureichend mit anderen Stadtteilen verbunden. Ein besonders ungünstiger Umstand ist, dass dieses Gelände im Vergleich zu den umgebenden Straßen und der Ufer- sicherung wesentlich niedriger gelegen ist. Mit einer gekonnten urbanistischen und architektonischen Einrichtung ließe sich das jedoch als Vorteil nutzen.

Durch die Wiederaufnahme des einstigen urbanistischen Konzepts von Staro Sajmište müsste die Staro-Sajmište-Straße ausschließlich internen Charakters sein, was auch eine neue Ausrichtung des Verkehrs in der weiteren Umgebung des Raumes mit sich zieht. Unseren Erkenntnissen nach ist auch ein Wieder- aufbau aller vorhandenen Systeme der Infrastruktur erforderlich.

5. Mangel an Finanzmitteln


7. Lack of financial resources

Rehabilitation of the Old Fairground is an undertaking that in addition to a clearly defined project and qualified and efficient project managing, involves considerable financial resources. Regarding the significance and complexity of this undertaking, it exceeds the capacity of local and city government, so it should become a state project. A special legal-administrative and financial mechanism needs to be defined for its realization (enacting a special law, forming special financial fund).

7. Недостатак финансијских ресурса

Рехабилитација Старог сајмишта је подухват који, поред јасног дефинисања пројекта и квалификованог и ефикасног управљања пројектом, подразумева и велика финансијска средства. Обзиром на значај и сложеност овог подухвата, он превазилази капацитете локалне самоуправе и градске управе, већ треба да постане државни пројекат. За његову реализацију би било потребно дефинисати посебан административно-правни и финансијски механизам (доношење посебног закона, формирање посебног финансијског фонда).

5. ENTWURF ZUR ERRIICHTUNG DER GEDÄNKSSTÄTTE “STARO SAJMIŠTE”


Konzept der räumlichen Gestaltung

Die Bauobjekte aus dem ehemaligen Lager (und der ersten Belgrader Messe) sind, wie bereits angeführt, nicht in ihrem ursprünglichen Zustand bewahrt. Aus diesem Grund kann die Präsentation des Kulturguts nicht etwa nach dem Modell der Поновном афирмацијом некадашњег урбанистичког концепта Старог сајмишта, улица Старо сајмиште би требало да има искључиво интерни карактер, што подразумева ново решение сахрањивања у широм окружењу предметне локације. На основу наших сазнања, потребно је извршити и реконструкцију свих постојећих инфраструктурних система.

5. 5. КОНЦЕПТ ФОРМИРАЊА МЕМОРИЈАЛНОГ КОМПЛЕКСА СТАРО САЈМИШТЕ

У претходном делу овог документа наведено је више пута да је, без иакве сумње, најзначајнија историјска вредност Старог сајмишта као страстишта у Другом светском рату. Из тог разлога, основна и једина намена овог комплекса би требало да буде меморијални комплекс који би, на потпуно модеран начин, у себи интегрисао три основне компоненте: образовање, науку и културу.

Просторни концепт

Објекти некадашњег логора (и Првог београдског сајма), као што је напред наведено, нису сачувани у аутентичном стању. Из тих разлога, презентација овог културног добра не може се заснивати на моделу нпр. меморијалног комплекса Auschwitz-
Complex (the Polish Parliament enacted legislation establishing the Auschwitz-Birkenau State Museum back in 1947). In Serbia, that kind of memorial place exists in Nis — a memorial camp museum “12th of February” (Red Cross). The complex of the former concentration camp “Red Cross” in Nis is defined as monument of great importance for the Republic of Serbia, by the Socialist Republic of the Executive Council’s decision in 1979.

In the Old Fairground’s case it is not possible to transfer the model of presenting historic events as applied in the memorial complex Yad Vashem – The Holocaust Victims and Heroes Remembrance Authority, an institution dedicated to studying and commemoration of Jews victims of the Holocaust, founded in 1953 in Jerusalem. This, the most important institution of its kind, is located in a place where crimes have not really occurred, in a place that is not killing-field.

As defined in the current detailed urban plan of the memorial complex, during revitalization (rehabilitation), all buildings that were once part of First Belgrade Fair, concentration camp: central tower, Spasic’s pavilion, Italian pavilion, Czechoslovakian pavilion, Turkish pavilion, pavilion Stefanovic and the Directorate building, must be preserved, reconstructed and returned to their former original state.

Regarding a new physical structure, the solution given in the detailed urban plan for the Memorial Complex of the Old Fairground is today also fully acceptable. It provides for the construction of new buildings in places and sizes of destroyed fair pavilions and a renewal of the original urbanism plan. This way the former urbanism would be reconstructed in totality, and the authentic fair pavilions would have received the spatial context in which they were created.

Program Concept

Regulations of the detailed urban plan concerning the physical structures are still applicable, but the regulations concerning purposes of buildings and space need to be revised. Namely, this plan document suggests that Spasic’s pavilion along with few other preserved pavilions serve for marking the memory of the camp, Gedenkstätte Auschwitz-Birkenau (Das polnische Parlament verabschiedete bereits 1947 ein Gesetz über die Gründung des staatlichen Museums „Auschwitz-Birkenau“). Eine Gedenkstätte dieser Art in Serbien befindet sich in Nis: Es handelt sich um das Gedenkmuseum des Lagers „12. Februar“ (Rotes Kreuz). Der Komplex des eisernen KZ-Lagers „Rotes Kreuz“ in Nis wurde mit Beschluss des Exekutivausschusses der Bundesrepublik Serbien von 1979 („Amtsblatt der BR Serbien“, Nr. 14/79) zum Kulturdenkmal besonderen Werts für die Republik Serbien erklärt.

Im Fall von Staro Sajmište lässt sich auch die Methode, historische Ereignisse zu präsentieren, welche im Gedenkkomplex Yad Vashem – The Holocaust Martyrs’ and Heroes’ Remembrance Authority, einer in 1953 in Jerusalem gegründeten Anstalt zu Erforschung und Gedenken an die jüdischen Opfer des Holocaust, nicht übertragen. Diese Anstalt, zugleich die weltweit bedeutendste ihrer Art, befindet sich an einem Ort, wo tatsächlich keine Verbrechen geschahen und welcher daher nicht als Stätte massenhafter Hinrichtungen gelten kann.

Wie im geltenden UDP für den Gedenkkomplex Staro Sajmište („Amtsblatt der Stadt Belgrad“, Nr. 2/92) festgehalten, sind beim Wiederaufbau (Neueinrichtung) des alten Messegelände alle Objekte, welche sich einst im Rahmen der ersten Belgrader Messe, d.h. des Lagers befanden, zu erhalten, rekonstruieren und in ihren einstigen Zustand zurückzuführen; diese sind: Zentralturm, Spasic-Pavillon, Italienischer, Tschechoslowakischer, Türkischer und Ungarischer Pavillon, Stefanović-Pavillon und Verwaltungsgebäude. In Bezug auf die neue physisch-urbane Struktur ist der im Urbansistischen Detailplan für den Gedenkkomplex Staro Sajmište („Amtsblatt der Stadt Belgrad“, Nr. 2/92) vorgeschlagene Entwurf, laut welchem die Errichtung neuer Bauten an Stelle und mit Maßen der niedrigeren Gesehenen Messepavillons und die Wiederherstellung der früheren urbanistischen Ausrichtung vorgesehen sind, auch heute noch gänzlich anwendbar. Auf diese Weise wäre die einstige urbanistische Einheit wiederhergestellt und den ursprünglichen, bis heute erhaltenen Messepavillons der Kontext verliehen, in welchem sie entstanden sind.

Programmewurf

Während die Bestimmungen aus dem UDP zur physischen Struktur immer noch umsetzbar sind, ist der Segment über die Nutzung der Obekte und des Geländes zu revidieren. Besagter Plan sieht nämlich vor, dass der Spasic-Pavillon sowie noch einige der erhaltenen Pavillons zum Gedenken an das Lager eingesetzt


У случају Старог сајмишта не може се пресликати ни модел презентовања историјских догађаја како је примењен у меморијалном комплексу Yad Vashem-The Holocaust Martyrs’ and heroes’ Remembrance Authority, институцији посвећеној проучавању и комеморацији Јевреја, жртава холокауста основаној 1953. године у Јерусалиму. Ова, најзначајнија институција ове врсте у свету, налази се на месту на коме се заправо нису десили злочини, на месту које није стратиште.

Као што је дефинисано у важећем ДУП-у споменичког комплекса Старо сајмиште (“Сл. лист града Београда” бр.2/92), приликом ревитализације (рехабилитације) Старог сајмишта морају се сачуваћи, реконструисати и вратити у некадашње, првобитно стање сви објекти који су некада били у саставу Првог београдског сајма, тј. логора: Центална кула, Спасићев, Италијански, Чехословачки, Турски и Мађарски павиљон, павиљон Стефановић и Управна зграда.

У погледу нове физичке структуре, решење дато у Детаљном урбанистичком плану споменичког комплекса Старо сајмиште (“Сл. лист града Београда” бр.2/92) које предвиђа изградњу нових зграда на местима и у габаритима порушеног сајмског павиљона и обнови првобитног урбанистичког решења, у потпуности је и данас прихватљиво. На тај начин се реконструиса некадашња урбанистичка целина, а аутентичним сајмским павиљонима, до данас очуваним, се обезбеђују просторни контекст у коме су настали.

Програмски концепт

Док су одредбе ДУП-а које се односе на физичку структуру и даље примењиве, одредбе које се односе на наземе објекта и простора подложне су ревизији. Након, овим планским документом је предложено да Спасићев павиљон и још неки од очуваних павиљона послуже за обележавање сећања на логор,
5.1. Proposals of Goals for Forming Memorial Complex Old Fairground

- Recollection and remembrance of the Holocaust and genocide victims
- Study of the Holocaust and genocide that occurred in the Old Fairground concentration camp (victims, perpetrators, witnesses, as well as the total historical and social context).
- Education of young generation about the Holocaust and genocide
- Raising the population’s awareness about the Holocaust and genocide phenomenon
- Encouraging increased number of citizens who condemn the Holocaust and genocide and influencing the strengthening of social values which condemn fascist, racist and anti-Semitic ideas.
- Increasing the number of professional institutions and politicians in memorial complex activities.
- Influencing society in order to prevent the Holocaust and genocide reoccurrence.

Activity of the Old Fairground Memorial Complex, an institution founded by special legislation, should be dedicated to following themes:

- Increasing the recognition and remembrance of the Holocaust and genocide victims.
- Encouraging the study of the Holocaust and genocide that occurred in the Old Fairground concentration camp (victims, perpetrators, witnesses, as well as the total historical and social context).
- Educating the young generation about the Holocaust and genocide.
- Raising the population’s awareness about the Holocaust and genocide phenomenon.
- Encouraging an increased number of citizens who condemn the Holocaust and genocide and influencing the strengthening of social values which condemn fascist, racist and anti-Semitic ideas.
- Increasing the number of professional institutions and politicians in memorial complex activities.
- Influencing society in order to prevent the Holocaust and genocide reoccurrence.


The Old Fairground should be marked partly and adequately through the reconstruction process or by the interpolation of elements that can be in a way associated with the concentration camp period. The plan has anticipates that studios and exhibition spaces can be adequately preserved in the other remaining pavilions. According to this plan, the purposes of new buildings that are to be built on the grounds of pavilions no longer in existence can be similar to the purposes that fair buildings have, but at the same time they have to be polyvalent purposes with an accent on cultural content.

Modern memorial complexes are dedicated to the remembrance of the Holocaust and genocide victims and they are established upon four program pillars: remembrance, documentation, investigation and education. Much more than turning one (or more) pavilion into a museum needs to be done if there is indeed a will to form such a center on the Old Fairground.

5.1. Vorschlag einer Zielsetzung bei der Einrichtung des Gedenkkomplexes „Staro Samište“:

- Gedenken an die Holocaust- und Völkermordopfer;
- Forschungsarbeit über Holocaust und Völkermord auf dem Gebiet von Staro Samište (Opfer, Täter und Zeugen sowie gesamter historischer und sozialer Kontext);
- Bildung junger Generationen zum Thema Holocaust und Völkermord;
- Herausbildung eines tieferen Bewusstseins über Holocaust und Völkermord in der breiten Öffentlichkeit;
- Förderung von Ablehnung des Holocaust und Völkermordes bei einer größeren Zahl von Bürgern, wodurch gesellschaftliche Werte gestärkt werden könnten, in welchen Faschismus, Rassismus und Antisemitismus inakzeptabel wären;
- Engagement einer größeren Zahl von Fachleuten, Institutionen und Trägern von politischen Faktionen am Wirken des Gedenk-Komplexes;
- Einfluss in der Gesellschaft, um Holocaust und Völkermord in Zukunft zu verhindern.

Das Wirken des Gedenkkomplexes Staro Samište als einer eigens gesetzlich begründeten Anstalt sollte sich folgenden Themen zuwenden:

- Sechsteilige und wohltätige Erinnerung an die Opfer des Holocaust und Völkermordes;
- Forschung und Dokumentation über den Holocaust und Völkermord auf dem Gebiet von Staro Samište (Opfer, Täter und Zeugen sowie gesamter historischer und sozialer Kontext);
- Bildung junger Generationen zum Thema Holocaust und Völkermord;
- Herausbildung eines tieferen Bewusstseins über Holocaust und Völkermord in der breiten Öffentlichkeit;
- Förderung von Ablehnung der Opfer des Holocaust und Völkermordes bei einer größeren Zahl von Bürgern, wodurch gesellschaftliche Werte gestärkt werden könnten, in welchen Faschismus, Rassismus und Antisemitismus inakzeptabel wären;
- Engagement einer größeren Zahl von Fachleuten, Institutionen und Trägern von politischen Faktionen am Wirken des Gedenk-Komplexes;
- Einfluss in der Gesellschaft, um Holocaust und Völkermord in Zukunft zu verhindern.

Das Wirken des Gedenkkomplexes Staro Samište als einer eigens gesetzlich begründeten Anstalt sollte sich folgenden Themen zuwenden:

- Sechsteilige und wohltätige Erinnerung an die Opfer des Holocaust und Völkermordes;
- Forschung und Dokumentation über den Holocaust und Völkermord auf dem Gebiet von Staro Samište (Opfer, Täter und Zeugen sowie gesamter historischer und sozialer Kontext);
- Bildung junger Generationen zum Thema Holocaust und Völkermord;
- Herausbildung eines tieferen Bewusstseins über Holocaust und Völkermord in der breiten Öffentlichkeit;
- Förderung von Ablehnung der Opfer des Holocaust und Völkermordes bei einer größeren Zahl von Bürgern, wodurch gesellschaftliche Werte gestärkt werden könnten, in welchen Faschismus, Rassismus und Antisemitismus inakzeptabel wären;
- Engagement einer größeren Zahl von Fachleuten, Institutionen und Trägern von politischen Faktionen am Wirken des Gedenk-Komplexes;
- Einfluss in der Gesellschaft, um Holocaust und Völkermord in Zukunft zu verhindern.

Das Wirken des Gedenkkomplexes Staro Samište als einer eigens gesetzlich begründeten Anstalt sollte sich folgenden Themen zuwenden:
5.2. Activities for Achieving These Goals:

- Presentation of victims experiences with proper museum installments and memorials in open, public space
- Documenting and preserving experiences of victims and survivors
- Inclusion of survivors in educational programs
- Publishing appropriate educational materials that will influence the formation of values of children and youth
- Providing quality availability of all resources for the public
- Intensive cooperation with domestic and foreign institutions

5.2. Maßnahmen, um diese Ziele zu erreichen:

- Präsentation der Erfahrungen von Opfern in entsprechenden Museumsausstellungen und durch Anbringung von Gedenktafeln in freiem, öffentlichem Raum
- Aufzeichnung und Bewahrung der Erfahrungen von Opfern und Überlebenden
- Einbeziehung von Überlebenden in die Bildungsprogramme
- Zusammenstellung entsprechenden Lehrmaterial, welches zur Herausbildung von Werten bei Kinder und Jugendlichen beitragen würde
- Gewährung von hochwertigem Zugang zu allen Ressourcen für die breite Öffentlichkeit
- Regie Zusammenarbeit mit Einrichtungen aus In- und Ausland

Vision:

Memorial Complex “Old Fairground” As a Unique Institution of this Kind in Eastern Europe

Mission:

Education of Youth so as to Prevent Reoccurrence of the Holocaust

Gedenkstätte Staro Sajmište als einzige Einrichtung dieser Art in Südosteuropa

Mission:

Bildung von Jugendlichen mit dem Ziel, Holocaust und Völkermord in Zukunft zu verhindern

Vision:

City of Belgrade - Cultural Heritage Preservation Agency

5.2. Активности којима се постижу ови циљеви:

- Презентовање искустава жртава одговарајућим музејским поставкама и спомен-обележјима у отвореном, јавном простору
- Документовање и чување искустава жртава и преживелих
- Укључивање преживелих у едукативне програме
- Израда одговарајућих едукативних материјала који ће утицати на формирање вредности код дече и младих
- Обезбеђивање квалитетне доступности свих ресурса широј јавности
- Интензивна сарадња са домаћим и страним институцијама
How to reach the goal?

• Enacting a special law on establishing a new institution – “Old Fairground” Memorial Complex
• Within the limits of cultural goods all real estate (land and buildings) has to be in state ownership, and given to the management of this institution
• Realization must be planned according to a long term program, phase by phase

5.3. Realization Phases

First phase would refer to preparatory activities for the establishment of the “Old Fairground” Memorial Complex, which are mainly administrative activities. This means maximum engagement of the existing institutions and resources with minimum financial expenditures. Within this phase the following things would be done:

1. Disabling the legalization of buildings that are on the cultural good and that are built without construction permit.
2. Disabling conversion of state property, on the land designated as a cultural good, to private property.
3. Enacting a law by which the Old Fairground Memorial Complex would be established.

At the same time, the Old Fairground should be on the list of priorities of all public communal companies in order to provide more efficient maintenance.

Second phase—Should the necessary decisions on establishing the Old Fairground Memorial Complex be made, and especially the law, then the second phase which would follow would cover the making of a program document which will define elements for announcing a international architectural-urbanism contest for the reconstruction of the Old Fairground complex.

The third phase would include the revitalization of all buildings that from the period of First Belgrade Fair which are still standing, and which are state owned. The Memorial Complex would begin its work in rehabilitated pavilions. Making of a new urbanism plan would start along with this process, after the international contest is finished.

Wie sind die Zeile zu erreichen?

• Verabschiedung eines Gesetzes über die Einrichtung einer neuen Institution: der Gedenkstätte Staro Sajmište
• Innerhalb der Grenzen des Kulturguts muss sämtliches Eigentum (Grundstücke und Bauobjekte) in staatlichem Eigentum sein und von besagter Institution verwaltet werden
• Die Umsetzung muss entsprechend langfristigem Plan und in Phasen erfolgen

5.3. Umsetzungsphasen

Die erste Phase würde sich auf Vorbereitungen zur Einrichtung der Gedenkstätte Staro Sajmište, welche vorwiegend verwaltungstechnisch und administrativ wären, beziehen. Darunter ist das höchste Engagement der bestehenden Einrichtungen und Ressourcen zu verstehen sowie eine möglichst geringe Beanspruchung finanzieller Mittel. In dieser Phase wäre Folgendes zu vollbringen:

1. Verhinderung der Legalisierung von auf dem Gelände des Kulturguts errichteter Bauobjekte, welche ohne Baugenehmigung errichtet wurden;
2. Verhinderung der Konversion von zum Kulturgut gehörndem Baugrund in staatlichem Eigentum zu Privateigentum;
3. Verabschiedung eines Gesetzes über die Einrichtung der Gedenkstätte Staro Sajmište

Zugleich sollte Staro Sajmište auf die Prioritätenliste aller relevanten öffentlichen Kommunalunternehmen aufgenommen werden, um effiziente Instandhaltung der Gedenkstätte zu gewährleisten.

Zweite Phase – Falls alle erforderlichen Beschlüsse über die Einrichtung der Gedenkstätte Staro Sajmište getroffen, vorwiegend jedoch die notwendigen Gesetze verabschiedet werden sollten, sollte in der zweiten Phase ein Programm vorgefunden werden, in welchem die Kriterien für ein internationales architektonisch-urbanistisches Ausschreiben zum Wiederaufbau von Staro Sajmište zu definieren wären.


Wie sind die Zeile zu erreichen?

• Verabschiedung eines Gesetzes über die Einrichtung einer neuen Institution: der Gedenkstätte Staro Sajmište
• Innerhalb der Grenzen des Kulturguts muss sämtliches Eigentum (Grundstücke und Bauobjekte) in staatlichem Eigentum sein und von besagter Institution verwaltet werden
• Die Umsetzung muss entsprechend langfristigem Plan und in Phasen erfolgen

5.3. Фазе реализации

Первая фаза должна включать в себя подготовительные мероприятия по созданию Мемориального комплекса, которые будут осуществляться в рамках административной деятельности. Это означает, что максимальное участие в этом процессе необходимо обеспечить в рамках существующих учреждений и ресурсов с минимальными финансовыми затратами. В эту фазу будут включены следующие мероприятия:

1. Помут легализации зданий, которые были построены без разрешения на строительство.
2. Помут конвертации государственной собственности на землю, отнесенную к культурному достоянию, в частную собственность.
3. Законодательное оформление образования Мемориального комплекса.

В то же время, Мемориальный комплекс должен быть включён в приоритетный список всех коммунальных компаний, чтобы обеспечить более эффективное обслуживание.

Вторая фаза — в случае принятия необходимых решений об образовании “Старого Сајмиште” Мемориального комплекса, а особенно закона, следует за первым и охватывает разработку программы объявления международного архитектурно-планировочного конкурса для реконструкции комплекса Старо Сајмиште.

Третья фаза включает в себя реализацию всех зданий, которые существовали в период Первого Београдского сајмишта и до сих пор стоят. Эти здания должны быть включены в работу восстановленных павильонов. Разработка нового архитектурно-планировочного плана должна начаться с этого момента, после завершения международного конкурса.

Како до циља?

• Доношење посебног закона о оснивању нове институције – Меморијалног комплекса Старо сајмиште
• У оквиру граница културног добра сва непокретна имовина (земљиште и објекти) морају бити у државној својини, а дати на управљање овој институцији
• Реализација се мора програмирати дугорочно, по фазама

5.3. Фазе реализације

Пријење фаза би се односила на припреме активности за формирање Меморијалног комплекса Старо сајмиште, које су углавном активности управног, административног типа. Она подразумева максималну ангажованост постојећих институција и ресурса, уз минимални утрошак финансијских средстава. У овој фази би било учињено следеће:

1. Онемогућавање легализације објеката у оквиру културног добра који су изграђени без одобрења за изградњу
2. Онемогућавање конверзије државног облика својине над грађевинским земљиштем у оквиру културног добра, у пративни облик својине
3. Доношење Закона о формирању меморијалног комплекса Старо сајмиште

У исто време, Старо сајмиште би требало уврстити у листу приоритета рада свих релевантних јавних комуналних предузећа, како би се обезбедило ефикасније одржавање.

Друга фаза – уколико се донесе потребне одлуке о формирању меморијалног комплекса Старо сајмиште, а поготово закон, другом фазом би требало обхватити израду Програмског документа из кога би се могли дефинисати елементи за расписивање международног архитектонско-урбанистичког конкурса за реконструкцију комплекса Старо сајмиште.

Трећа фаза би обухватала ревитализацију свих објеката који су сачувани из периода Првог Београдског сајма, а који у том моменту буду у државној својини. У ревитализованим павиљонима отпочео би са радом Меморијални комплекс. Упоредо са овим процесом, а по завршетку международног конкурса, приступило би се изради новог урбанистичког плана.
The fourth phase would involve successive creation of investment-technical documentation for new buildings, their construction, as well as complete regulation of the complex, in coherency with the dynamics of providing funds.

In der vierten Phase käme es zu einer sukzessiven Ausarbeitung von technischen Anlageunterlagen für neue Objekte und ihren Bau sowie für die gänzliche Gestaltung des Komplexes gemäß der Dynamik, in welcher Geldmittel zur Verfügung gestellt werden könnten.

Четврта фаза би подразумевала сукцесивну израду инвестиционо-техничке документације за нове објекте, њихову изградњу, као и целовито уређење комплекса, у складу са динамиком обезбеђивања средстава.
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Spasić Pavillon - as it had been used for disco concerts
SAJMIŠTE — AN EXTERMINATION CAMP IN SERBIA

MENACHEM SHELACH
Oranim School of Education, Haifa University, Israel


Abstract — German army reprisals against the local Serbian population’s resistance to the Occupation, between August and December 1941, were used by the army as an excuse to murder the Jewish men of Serbia. Jewish women and children (8000-9000) were then interned in Sajmište, a concentration camp established at the site of an abandoned exhibition ground on the outskirts of Belgrade. After seeking RSHA aid to deal with these Jews, the local German administration received a gas van with which it murdered the Jews, from March to May 1942. This is the only known instance of on-the-spot gassing outside of Eastern Europe.

On the left bank of the Sava river, not far from where it flows into the Danube, and hidden among the modern buildings of new Belgrade, stands the Sajmište Fairground. Today, the decrepit, old barracks shelter poor Gypsies and the homeless human rejects of the socialist society. People huddle around an open fire, as laundry flutters in the wind, in the shadow of what was once an impressive tower. Near what was originally the main entrance, the following words are written:

In this place, between 1941-1944 stood a concentration camp erected by the German Fascists. Let us remember the victims who perished here.

This small plaque, insignificant to passers-by, calls attention to a place from which the anguished cries of thousands of women and children emanated only 45 years ago. Here, beside this broken gate, in the spring of 1942, these people were forced into a gas van and put to death as the van passed through the main streets of Belgrade. In this forsaken place the tragedy of the Serbian Jews came to its end.

WHAT SHALL WE DO WITH THE WOMEN AND CHILDREN?

On 6 April 1941, the Germans and their Allies invaded Yugoslavia. The Yugoslav army collapsed in a fortnight and the former Yugoslav state was divided

SAJMIŠTE – LOGOR ZA ISTREBLJIVANJE U SRBIJI

MENAHEM ŠELAH
Pedagoški fakultet Oranim, Univerzitet Haifa, Izrael

[Ovo je izmenjena verzija članka na hebrejskom jeziku objavljenog u Studijama o periodu Holokausta IV (Studies on the Holocaust Period IV), Univerzitet Haifa, 1986.]


Na levoj obali Save, nedaleko od ušća u Dunav, sakriveno između modernih zgrada Novog Beograda, nalazi se Sajmište.1 Danas siromašni cigani i beskućnici, ljudi odbačeni od socijalističkog društva nastanjuju oronule stare barake. Ljudi se guraju oko otvorene vatre dok se veš vijori na vetru, u senci nekada impresivne kule. Pored nekadašnjeg glavnog ulaza, ispisane su ove reči:

Na ovom mestu, od 1941. do 1944, nalazio se koncentracioni logor koji su podigli nemački fašisti. Setimo se žrtava koje su na ovom mestu izgubile život.

Ova mala ploča, nebitna slučajnim prolaznicima, skreće pažnju na mesto sa koga su pre samo 40 godina dopirali izmučeni krinci hiljada žena i dece. Ovdje, pored ove slomljene kapije, u proleće 1942. godine, ti ljudi su silom odvođeni u dušegupku i ubijani dok su voženi glavnim ulicama Beograda. Na ovom napuštenom mestu završila se tragedija srpskih Jevreja.

1 The camp had several names. The Germans called it ‘Judenlager Semlin’, the Serbs ‘Jevrejski Logor Sajmište’ and the Jews ‘Jevrejski Logor Zemun’. This article uses the contempor-ary Yugoslav name ‘Sajmište’.

among the invaders. Germany occupied Serbia, the heart of Yugoslavia and the focus of its independence. Shortly thereafter, a German military administration was established in Belgrade. It was headed by a German General, but in reality various German authorities fought among themselves for hegemony in Serbia. The head of the German civilian administration was SS *Gruppenführer* Harald Turner, an experienced administrator who previously headed the military administration in Occupied Paris. Turner was an old SS man with very good connections among the higher echelons of the SS, and he had widespread authority in all civilian matters. Under his command (and sometimes opposing him) was a special commando unit of the RSHA, *Einsatzgruppe Serbien*, whose main tasks, similar to those of commandos that operated in Poland, were to take care of internal security, fight against opponents of the Occupation, keep track of suspicious elements and deal with the Jewish problem. The head of the *Einsatzgruppe* was, until January 1942, SS *Standartenführer* Wilhelm Fuchs, and after that these activities were undertaken by SS *Gruppenführer* August Meyssner with SS *Standartenführer* Emanuel Schäfer as his deputy. Others involved in the decision-making process on Jewish policy were: the Belgrade representative of the German Foreign Office, Felix Benzler, who was a professional diplomat, and Hans Neuhausen, the plenipotentiary for the economy, and in essence Göring’s representative in Serbia. These men were required to coordinate all measures with the army, especially after the beginning of the Serbian rebellion in July 1941.2

The implementation of the Jewish policy, always one of the main goals of the Nazi regime, was the responsibility of the local Gestapo. The commander of the Belgrade Gestapo was SS *Sturmbannführer* Bruno Sattler, with SS *Sturmbannführer* Stracke as the head of its Jewish Department. A short time after the Occupation of Belgrade, the Germans published the usual array of anti-Jewish legislation which included compulsory registration of all Jews, removal from jobs, confiscation of property (i.e. legalized plunder), restriction of movement, segregation and compulsory hard labour in the bombed city.3

The oppressive measures imposed on the Serbian population by the German authorities after the start of the German-Russian War on 22 June 1941 caused


Represivne mere koje su nemačke vlasti nametnule srpskom stanovništvu posle početka nemačko-ruskog rata, 22. juna 1941, izazvale su spontanu po-


a spontaneous rebellion all over Serbia. The Germans, as part of the measures used to crush the rebellion, imprisoned all Jewish men in concentration camps under the false pretense that, ‘the Jews are inciting the population and are leading the revolt’, hence, their incarceration was a preventive measure. The Germans, of course, knew that very few Jews actually participated in the resistance and that there were practically no Jews among its leaders.

Jews who were prepared, in fact, to join the partisans could not because of extremely tight German supervision. Among hundreds of acts of sabotage against German objectives, we know (as the Germans knew then) of only one case which was carried out by a Jewish boy.

At the end of August 1941, all Jewish men in Serbia were imprisoned in concentration camps, primarily in the Topovska Šupa camp in Belgrade. At the same time, the Germans began to execute the Jews as part of the German hostage retaliation policy. Orders were issued by Hitler and the head of the OKW, Feldmarschall Keitel, to all German army units in Serbia to shoot 50-100 ‘communists’ for every German killed. The local army command chose the higher number and added the provision to kill 50 hostages for every German wounded. In addition, the German army, in its anti-partisan campaign, burned and pillaged villages, and evicted the local population. It must be emphasized and repeatedly pointed out that the Wehrmacht willingly and consciously carried out these actions.

The Jews, as previously noted, took no part in the Serbian rebellion, but bore the brunt of the German retaliation policy. Until the end of 1941, most of the male Serbian Jews were shot. A Yugoslav historian points out that, ‘The Serb revolt was carried out by a Jewish boy.’

4 Evidence that the Germans were perfectly aware that Jews did not participate in the Serbian rebellion may be found in a private letter from Turner in October 1941 to his friend and mentor SS Gruppenführer Hildebrandt in which he writes ‘...2200 [men] ... most of them Jews, will be shot in the next eight days ...’ The Jewish question solves itself most quickly in this way. Actually it is false, if one is to be precise about it, that for murdered Germans — on whose account the ratio 1.100 should be borne by Serbs — 100 Jews are shot instead; the Jewish question solves itself most quickly in this way. Actually it is false, if one is to be precise about it, that for murdered Germans — on whose account the ratio 1.100 should be borne by Serbs — 100 Jews are shot instead; the Jews are in camps ... and besides they have to disappear [und sie müssen ja auch verschwinden].’ See International Military Tribunal [hereafter IMT], NO 5810.4

5 About Almoslino and the shooting of 122 Jewish hostages see Zločini protiv Jevreja u Jugoslaviji, ed. Zdenko Levental (Beograd: Savez Jevrejskih Opština, 1952), pp. 15-17; German documents, IMT, NOKW 251, 551, 1057, NO 9252.

6 About Almoslino and the shooting of 122 Jewish hostages see Zločini protiv Jevreja u Jugoslaviji, ed. Zdenko Levental (Beograd: Savez Jevrejskih Opština, 1952), pp. 15-17; German documents, IMT, NOKW 251, 551, 1057, NO 9252.


9 Ivanović, ‘Teror nad Jevrejima u Beogradu’, str. 299, IMT, NOK 192. Primer toga je posledica bitke kod
was, in German eyes, only an excuse for annihilating [the Jews]. Jewish inmates were supplied by the SD men responsible for the Jewish camps whenever the quota of hostages needed by the army was not filled.

Plans for the fate of the Jewish Serbian women and children by the heads of the German administration began even before all the Jewish men were killed. In October 1941, while Wehrmacht shooting detachments worked overtime, a meeting of high-ranking officials was convened in Belgrade to consider the Jewish problem in Serbia. The demand for such a meeting came from the head of the civil administration, Harald Turner, and from Felix Benzler, the local Foreign Office representative. They both harangued their Berlin superiors to free them from what they termed the ‘Jewish nuisance’, as they repeatedly requested the evacuation of the Jews either to Rumania or to the East. Berlin’s reply was negative, and the persistence of the two men angered the Foreign Office and the RSHA. Ribbentrop asked Martin Luther, the head of the Deutschland Department, to deal with the matter, and in turn Luther handed the problem over to Franz Rademacher, the department Referent on the Jewish question. Rademacher then applied to his counterpart at the RSHA, Adolf Eichmann. In a phone conversation between the two, in Luther’s presence, Rademacher asked Eichmann’s advice on the problem of the Serbian Jews and the answer was short and to the point: ‘Shoot [them]’ (erschiessen!). This very practical conversation prompted Luther to send an angry message to his Belgrade representative, Benzler: ‘If the German army commander in Serbia thinks that the Jews interfere in the cleanup operation... it is his duty to get rid of them... in other parts [of Europe] the local army commanders eliminated a lot more Jews without making such a fuss.7

Apparently, because of a snag in communications, neither the Foreign Office, nor Eichmann’s office, knew of the wholesale killings by the Wehrmacht in Serbia. Consequently, in October 1941, Rademacher and two officials from Eichmann’s office, SS Sturmbannführer Suhr and SS Untersturmführer Stoschke were sent to check on the situation in Belgrade, where they met with Turner, Benzler...
and Fuchs. They were then informed about the army’s initiative and the execution of the male Jews. It was clear that now at least a part of the Jewish problem was being solved. The local officials asked the guests from Berlin to help them get rid of the remaining women and children, once and for all. Turner and Benzler again raised the possibility of deporting the women and children to Rumania or to the East. Rademacher, representing his boss, Ribbentrop, vetoed the Rumanian option and Eichmann’s representatives explained that because of an overall plan, the Serbian Jews could not be transported to the East before the summer of 1942. Their conclusion was to concentrate the women and children temporarily in a camp and deal with them later.10

Turner and his staff began to search for a site for the planned concentration camp. At first, they considered establishing a ghetto in the Gypsy quarter of Belgrade, but the site was so filthy and unhygienic that even the Germans, who were not particularly fastidious when dealing with the Jews, were appalled. Later, somebody raised the possibility of shipping the Jews to an island on the Danube near the city of Mitrovica, but the plan was abandoned when the area was flooded during the rainy season. The solution that was finally found was practically on the doorstep of the German Command. On the left bank of the Sava river, a mile from the centre of Belgrade, near the Zemun bridge, stood a score of empty buildings that were used before the war as an exhibition centre. The site, known as Sajmište, was built at the end of the 1930s by the Belgrade municipality in an attempt to attract international commerce to the city. The war put an end to that possibility until a German official had the ‘brilliant’ idea to use the area as a camp for Jewish women and children who ‘endanger’ the public safety and the German army.

There is no doubt that the site was perfectly suited to the German purpose. It was situated on a peninsula surrounded on three sides by the Sava river, a fact which facilitated the guarding of the inmates and made escape almost impossible. It was located near the administrative and security police centres which insured maximum control; and last but not least it was near the Belgrade central railway station which allowed for the deportation of the Jews from all over Serbia to Sajmište, and for the eventuality of their shipment to the East.11

The interior of Jevreja. Bilo je jasno da se sada rešava makar deo jevrejskog problema. Lokalni zvančnici zastražili su od gostiju iz Berlina da im pomognu da se jednom za svagda reše preostali žena i dece. Turner i Bencler su ponovo naveli mogućnost deportacije žena i dece u Rumuniju ili na Istok. Ribentrop je stavio veto na rumunsku opciju, a Ahjmanovi predstavnici su objasnili da zbog sveukupnog plana srpski Jevreji ne mogu biti deportovani na Istok pre leta 1942. godine. Došli su do zaključka da žene i deca budu privremeno koncentrisani u logoru i da se njihovo pitanje reši kasnije.10

Turner i njegovo osoblje započeli su potragu za lokacijom za planirani koncentracioni logor. U početku su razmatrali mogućnost uspostavljanja geta u ciganskom delu Beograda, ali to mesto je bilo toliko prljavo i nehigijensko da su čak i Nemci, inače ne preterano izbirljivi pri rešavanju pitanja Jevreja, bili užasnjeni. Kasnije je neko predložio slanje Jevreja na ostrov na Dunavu blizu Mitrovice, ali se od tog plana odustalo kada je ova oblast poplavljena tokom kишne sezone. Rešenje do koga se na kraju došlo je bilo takoreći ispred nosa Nemačke komande. Na levom obali Save, oko kilometar i po od centra Beograda, blizu Zemunskog mosta, nalazila se grupa praznih zgrada koje su pre rata služile kao sajamski prostor. Ovo mesto, poznato kao Sajmište, izgradila je beogradska opština krajem tridesetih godina u pokušaju da privuče međunarodnu trgovinu u grad. Izbijanje rata onemogućilo je bilo kakvu upotrebu Sajmišta, sve dok neki nemački zvančnik nije došao na ‘sajnu’ ideju da se ovo mesto iskoristi kao logor za jevrejske žene i decu koji ‘ugrozavaju’ javnu bezbednost i nemačku vojsku.

Ova lokacija je savršeno odgovarala nameni koju su Nemci odredili. Sajmište se nalazilo na poluostrvu okruženom rekom Savom sa tri strane, što je olakšavalo čuvanje zatočenika, a bekstvo činilo je i pravo za deportaciju Jevreja iz svih delova Srbije na Sajmište i njihovo eventualno slanje na Istok.11 Unutrašnjost logora bila je pogodna, sa zgradama različite veličine

10 Ibid., 06/170. For more about the meeting, see YV TR 10/628, 68-71.
11 The Sava riverbed has been changed since the end of the war. At that time it surrounded Sajmište on three sides. A photograph of the site on the eve of the war can be found in Jovan Ivanović and Mladen Vukomanović, Dani Smrti na Sajmištu (Novi Sad: Savez Udruženja boraca NO. Rata Srbije, 1969), p. 6.
the camp was conveniently ready with buildings of different sizes that ultimately served various purposes, such as housing, administration, storage, etc. A tower that was originally intended as a lookout point, stood in the centre of the compound and was used as a watchtower.

Sajmište had two drawbacks: first, anybody standing on the Kalemegdan Hill, located in the centre of Belgrade, could easily see into the camp, and secondly, Sajmište was situated in the territory of the so-called ‘Independent State of Croatia’, a puppet state carved by the Germans in the division of Yugoslavia and ruled by a fanatical fascist-terrorist paramilitary group called the Ustasha. The problem of the Croat sovereignty was easily solved. A formal appeal from the German Foreign Office to the Croat government was immediately approved. As to the matter of secrecy: apparently at this stage of the war, when the Germans seemed assured of victory, they were not troubled by the possibility of their criminal acts being discovered. There is a certain contradiction between the strict secret orders we find in many documents regarding the mass murders, and the public activities in Belgrade. As late as mid-1943, long after the murder of the Jews, when the camp was used for the incarceration of Serbs, the German Foreign Office representative in the Balkans, Herman Neubacher, urged that the camp be shut down because ‘Its continued existence, in clear view of the residents of Belgrade, is detrimental for morale and undesirable for policy.’ His appeal was rejected. When the positive reply arrived from the Croatians, Turner sent a warning to all concerned to be ready from 15 November 1941 for the transfer of the Jewish women and children to the camp.

In his excellent article about Sajmište, Professor Christopher Browning emphasizes the high degree of cooperation and the unusual harmony with which all German government organs dealt with the matter of Sajmište. While the ‘five kings of Serbia’ (as Browning terms the military commander, General Bader, Fuchs, Turner, Benzler and Neuhausen) were notoriously unable to agree on most matters, the selection, diplomatic negotiations, construction and financing of the Semlin (Sajmište) Judenlager proved a rare example of frictionless cooperation. The army supplied the logistics, Turner coordinated the whole operation, Fuchs' matters, the selection, diplomatic negotiations, construction and financing of the camp was originally intended as a lookout point, stood in the centre of the compound and was used as a watchtower.
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In his excellent article about Sajmište, Professor Christopher Browning emphasizes the high degree of cooperation and the unusual harmony with which all German government organs dealt with the matter of Sajmište. While the ‘five kings of Serbia’ (as Browning terms the military commander, General Bader, Fuchs, Turner, Benzler and Neuhausen) were notoriously unable to agree on most matters, the selection, diplomatic negotiations, construction and financing of the Semlin (Sajmište) Judenlager proved a rare example of frictionless cooperation. The army supplied the logistics, Turner coordinated the whole operation, Fuchs'
Security Police were directly responsible for the camp, as his men stood guard and engineered the gassings, Benzler took care of the diplomatic side and Neuhausen, the economic dictator, financed the project.

**THE CAMP IS READY**

Three weeks passed between Turner’s order and the arrival of the first inmates. During that time, work parties consisting mostly of Jewish men who were kept alive specifically for this purpose, prepared the camp to absorb a large number of people.¹⁶ The Sajmište compound had been badly damaged in the German bombing of the Yugoslav capital at the beginning of the war. All the windows were smashed, some of the buildings had cracked walls with big holes in the roofs, and there were almost no doors. In essence, the buildings were totally unfit for normal habitation. The labourers did all they could to repair the damage; some of the windows were shuttered and a few doors were replaced, but they could not fix the roofs and the repairs were very superficial. In the biggest pavilion (number 3), wooden beds were erected in three tiers. The smaller buildings were designated as an infirmary, a kitchen, wash rooms, administration, etc. In retrospect, the preparations clearly indicate the total lack of concern on the part of the Germans for providing adequate living conditions for the inmates. Four rows of barbed wire encircled the camp and a score of guard towers with spotlights were erected.¹⁷

At a meeting in Belgrade on 3 December 1941 with General Kuntze, the deputy commander of the German army in the Balkans, it was decided that All Jews and Gypsies shall be interned in the Semlin [Sajmište] camp because it was proven that they were intelligence agents of the rebels.¹⁸ Four days later, on 7 December, Serbian policemen, who had helped the Germans in previous anti-Jewish manhunts, issued an order to all Jewish women to appear on the following day with their children at the police station, at 23 Washington Street. They were allowed to bring food for three days and personal baggage. In addition, they were ordered to lock their apartments and hand over the keys, marked with their addresses, at the police station.

The next day, hundreds of Jewish women and children carrying their last possessions, trudged through the streets of Belgrade. Near the police station, the

**LOGOR JE SPREMAN**

Prošle su tri nedelje od Turnerovog naredenja do pristizanja prvih logoraša. Za to vreme, radne grupe sačinjene uglavnom od jvrejskih muškaraca koji su ostavljeni u životu samo za tu namenu, pripremale su logor za prihvat veлиkoj broja ljudi.¹⁶ Sajmište je teško oštećeno tokom nemačkog bombardovanja jugoslavenske prestonice na početku rata. Svi prozori su bili slomljeni, neke od zgrada su imale napukle zidove sa velikim rupama u krovovima, a vrata gotovo da nije ni bilo. U suštini, zgrade su bile potpuno nepodesne za normalno stanovanje. Radnici su uradili koliko su mogli da poprave štetu: zakucaši su se od prozora i zamenili nekoliko vrata, ali nisu mogli da poprave krov, tako da su radovi bili veoma površni. U najvećem paviljonu (br. 3), postavljeni su drveni kreveti na tri sprata. Manje zgrade su služile kao ambulanta, kuhinja, perionica, uprava, itd. Ovakve pripreme jasno pokazuju potpuno odsustvo brige Nemaca za obezbeđivanje adekvatnih uslova života zatočenicima. Logor je bio opasan sa četiri reda bodljikave žice, a podignuto je nekoliko stražarskih kula sa reflektorsima.¹⁷


Sledećeg dana, stotine jvrejskih žena i dece se su vukli ulicama Beograda noseći svoju poslednju imovinu. U blizini policijske stanice, policajci su pre-

¹⁶ Na oktobarskom sastanku odlučeno je da se 500 jvrejskih muškaraca poštedi da bi radili na Sajmištu. Vidi Napomenu 10.
¹⁷ Ivanović i Vukomanović, Dani smrti, str. 8-9.
¹⁸ NOWK 1500. Kunce je u Nurembergu tvrdio da o celoj stvari nije znao ništa.
policemen searched the arrivals and took all their valuables. It was a very cold morning day, and the people huddled together for warmth while waiting until late night for the lorries to arrive. During the next three days, the lorries shuttled around in confusion looking for a place to lie down. Children and babies cried and screamed, the sick moaned and old people fell wherever they stood; fights broke out among the highly strung and nervous people, and the terrible cold affected everyone. One of the few survivors testified after the war that 'on arriving at Sajmište, we were put in pavilion 3 .... The windows were broken, the walls cracked, snow fell through the open roof onto the concrete floor and the puddles froze.' Another inmate described the living conditions:

Everyone was allotted a space for lying down of about a half meter. The climb to the third layer was very dangerous .... often women, particularly the elderly and famished, collapsed and were seriously injured, and some even died. The moisture on the walls froze and we felt like we were living in a refrigerator .... from the beds above, the children's secretions fell on those below .... and the straw on which we slept and which was not changed became a stinking, filthy, wet mess. We did not get any blankets or sheets and those who did not bring any with them, froze during the night.21

The food in the camp was below all standards, both qualitatively and quantitatively. It was supplied by the Belgrade municipality who allotted food to Sajmište only after first taking care of the Serb population, who themselves were subjected to very harsh rationing by the Germans. The food problem in the camp reached such proportions that even the brutal and callous SS medical officer, Dr. Jung, intervened at the end of December 1941 and demanded a double ration of the daily bread from the administration. His demand was rejected. The food that arrived at the camp was usually unfit for human consumption. Potato and cabbage, the mainstays of the daily menu, were usually rotten, and all complaints were futile because nobody really cared about the fate of the Jewish women and children.22
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The terrible anguish of the imprisoned women is expressed in the letters of Hilda Deutsch, a young woman who voluntarily joined the inmates as a nurse. She writes: ‘We, the inmates, are turning into wild beasts because of the terrible hunger. We are sullen, impatient, and constantly counting our fellow prisoners’ bites. We are desperate.’ The unavoidable result of the unhygienic conditions, overcrowding, the cold weather and the undernourishment was a total deterioration of the inmates’ health. A staff member at one of Belgrade’s hospitals recounted:

During the winter [of 1941-2] we got a score of new patients: Women from Sajmište. With them came children with frostbite. Their nails fell off because of cold and hunger. They looked like living skeletons, only skin and bones. Children’s eyes stared at us out of old men’s faces. They did not look like children at all. The women refused to talk about what was going on in Sajmište.24

In the wake of the physical breakdown came the mental breakdown. Once again we read about it in the letters of Hilda Deutsch:

I cannot find tranquility for my tormented soul. My philosophical thoughts are crushed on the barbed wire of terrible reality. If you there, outside, could imagine our plight, you would surely howl. It is impossible to describe our life, our terrible sufferin The so-called mental faculties are drowned in tears of hunger and cold. The hope of future redemption is destroyed by our passive existence, an existence which has no similarity to the thing you call ‘life’. It is an impossible tragedy. We live, not because we are strong, but because of our unawareness of our real situation.25

In January 1942, at the peak of the hunger, the inmates attempted a protest. The head of the Jewish department at the Belgrade Gestapo, SS Sturmführer Stracke, immediately arrived and in a speech in front of all the prisoners declared that if anything like this happened again he would shoot 100 inmates on the spot.26 The death toll in the camp grew daily and corpses were removed from the morgue, situated in the former Turkish pavilion, for burial somewhere across the ice-covered river.27

Strašne muke zatočenih žena iskazane su u pismima Hilde Dajč, mlade žene koja je volontirala kao medicinska sestra. Ona piše: ‘Mi, logoraši, pretvaramo se u divlje zveri usled strašne gladi. Potišteni smo, nestrpljivi i neprekidno brojimo tude zalogaje. Očajni smo.’ Potpuno narušavanje zdravlja zatočenika bilo je neizbežno usled nehigijenskih uslova, prenatarjanosti, hladnog vremena i nehranjenosti. Član osobila jedne od beogradskih bolnica se priseća:


Kao posledica fizičkog, usledio je mentalni slom. Ponovo čitamo o tome u pismima Hilde Dajč:


U januaru 1942. na vrhuncu gladovanja, logoraši su pokušali da organiziraju protest. Načelnik Odseka za Jevreje pri beogradskom Gestapou, SS šturmführer Strake, odmah je stigao i pred svima objavio da će njih 100 biti streljano na licu mesta ukoliko se bilo šta nalik tome dogodi. Broj mrtvih u logoru je rastao iz dana u dan, a leševi su uklanjani iz mrtvačnice koja se nalazala u nekadašnjem Turskom paviljoni i sahranjivani negde preko zaleđene reke, na beogradskoj strani. U jednom od svojih pisma, Hilda Dajč navodi da je jednog jutra po ulasku u mrtvačnicu videla tela 25 ljudi koji su umrli tokom noći.27 Teško je


25 Pisma Hilde Dajč

26 Ivanović i Vukomanović, Dani smrti, str. 24

27 Pisma Hilde Dajč
tered river, on the Belgrade side. In one of her letters, Hilda Deutsch writes that on entering the morgue one morning she saw the bodies of 25 people who had died during the night. It is difficult to estimate the number of people who died at Sajmište before the gassings, but we have an indication by the percentage of Gypsies who died in Sajmište during their six weeks’ stay. During that time 57 out of 600 Gypsies died, approximately 10%.28 In addition to the physical and mental hardships, the inmates were particularly troubled by the total absence of communication with anybody outside the camp and with any aspect of the life they saw going on not far away, in the big city. The Germans were determined to cut off Sajmište completely.

We are so near and so far from anyone [writes Hilda Deutsch], there is no chance of being freed in the near future .... What do they plan to do with us? Our nerves are strung Are they going to kill us? To blow us up? Shall we be sent to Poland? .... We could stand all hardships if we could fathom what is in store for us. Oh my God, when, oh when, shall the gates of mercy open up!29

Uncertainty bred all kinds of rumours. The rumours spread and were inflated, hopes were born and shattered. The Germans encouraged this in order to confuse, demoralize and weaken the willpower of the prisoners, a calculated measure for their eventual purpose — murder. The pitiful and human delusions which the Jews needed in order to sustain their sanity were exploited by the Germans.30

THE GAS VANS ARRIVE

Between December 1941 and January 1942, as ‘life’ in the camp continued, the Germans sought a solution to their ultimate goal, the disposal of the women and children. Realizing that shipping them to the East before the summer was impossible, they pressed Berlin for a radical solution. One must ask why the Nazi leaders were determined to cut off Sajmište completely.

THE DESTINY OF EUROPE’S GYPSIES

The German policy toward the Gypsies was ambiguous and inconsistent. They were marked in the Third Reich as a social and criminal element and as such were imprisoned in concentration camps. See Donald Kenrick and Grattan Paxton, The Destiny of Europe’s Gypsies (London: Chatto-Heinemann, 1972), pp 59-100. In Serbia the local commanders were authorized to exempt the so-called ‘productive and positive’ Gypsies from incarceration. Many Serbian Gypsies were shot together with the Jews, others were employed by the Germans as gravediggers. The Gypsy women and children (mostly from the Srem district) who were brought to Sajmište were freed from the camp several days before the beginning of the gassings. There may be a connection there.

In addition to the physical and mental hardships, the inmates were particularly troubled by the total absence of communication with anybody outside the camp and with any aspect of the life they saw going on not far away, in the big city. The Germans were determined to cut off Sajmište completely.

We are so near and so far from anyone [writes Hilda Deutsch], there is no chance of being freed in the near future .... What do they plan to do with us? Our nerves are strung Are they going to kill us? To blow us up? Shall we be sent to Poland? .... We could stand all hardships if we could fathom what is in store for us. Oh my God, when, oh when, shall the gates of mercy open up!29

Uncertainty bred all kinds of rumours. The rumours spread and were inflated, hopes were born and shattered. The Germans encouraged this in order to confuse, demoralize and weaken the willpower of the prisoners, a calculated measure for their eventual purpose — murder. The pitiful and human delusions which the Jews needed in order to sustain their sanity were exploited by the Germans.30

Pored fizičkih i mentalnih patnji, logoraši su se naročito teško nosili sa potpunim nedostatkom komunikacije sa bilo kim izvan logora, kao i sa bilo kojim vidom života koji bi videli u velikom gradu nedaleko od logora. Nemci su bili rešeni da u potpunosti odsek Sajmište od sveta.


Usled neizvesnosti kolale su razne glasine koje su se širile i preuveličavale, a nade radale i umirale. Nemci su to namerno podsticali ne bi li zぶnuli, demoralisali i oslabili snagu volje logoraša: bila je to proračunata mera za ispunjenje njihove konačne namere — ubistva. Nemci su iskorišćavali jadne ljudske iluzije koje su Jeffrevima bile potrebne zarad očuvanja zdravog razuma.30

THE GAS VANS ARRIVE

Between December 1941 and January 1942, as ‘life’ in the camp continued, the Germans sought a solution to their ultimate goal, the disposal of the women and children. Realizing that shipping them to the East before the summer was impossible, they pressed Berlin for a radical solution. One must ask why the Nazi leaders were determined to cut off Sajmište completely.

We are so near and so far from anyone [writes Hilda Deutsch], there is no chance of being freed in the near future …. What do they plan to do with us? Our nerves are strung Are they going to kill us? To blow us up? Shall we be sent to Poland? …. We could stand all hardships if we could fathom what is in store for us. Oh my God, when, oh when, shall the gates of mercy open up?29

Uncertainty bred all kinds of rumours. The rumours spread and were inflated, hopes were born and shattered. The Germans encouraged this in order to confuse, demoralize and weaken the willpower of the prisoners, a calculated measure for their eventual purpose — murder. The pitiful and human delusions which the Jews needed in order to sustain their sanity were exploited by the Germans.30

STIŽE KAMION-DUŠEGUPKA

Između decembra 1941. i januara 1942. dok je ‘život’ u logoru tekao dalje, Nemci su tražili način da ispune svoj konačni cilj i reše se žena i dece. Shvativši da je nemoguće poslati ih na Istok pre leta, vršili su pritiska na Berlin zahtjevajući radikalno rešenje. Postavljala se pitanje zašto nacističke vode nisu u Srbiji odobrile metod pri kome pogubljenja vrše Ažnjacegruppen, kao što su učinili u Rusiji?
ership did not apply the method of execution by *Einsatzgruppen* here in Serbia, as they did in Russia. It may be that since the shootings in Serbia were executed by the *Wehrmacht*, a group not as highly motivated or as thoroughly indoctrinated as the *Einsatzgruppen*, the Nazi leadership was hesitant to use the same method of operation. The results of the wholesale shootings in the East, as well as certain mental effects suffered by the members of the army’s killing squads in Serbia, alerted the commanders to the possible psychological dangers of assigning the regular army to this task. Although there was some connection between *Einsatzgruppen* killings in the East and the murders carried out by the *Wehrmacht* in Serbia, the methods were different.31

In the absence of sufficient documentation we do not know how the idea of bringing a gas van to Belgrade to murder the Sajmište inmates by asphyxiation originated. It would be worthwhile at this time, however, to present the members of the German staff who were personally involved in the gassings.

In order to put an end to the constant fights and friction between Harald Turner, the head of the civil administration, and the head of the Security Police and the SD in Serbia, SS *Standartenführer* Wilhelm Fuchs, the latter was dismissed in January 1942. Fuchs was replaced by SS *Gruppenführer* August Meyszner, an SS official of much higher authority, and personally sanctioned by Hitler. Meyszner was not the subordinate that his predecessor was. He was Himmler’s representative and he supervised the gassings. Meyszner arrived from Berlin with SS *Standartenführer* Emanuel Schäfer, who was appointed head of the Belgrade Security Police which supervised the Sajmište Camp.32 Schäfer was no stranger to Jewish policy as the head of the Gestapo in Cologne, where he was responsible for the deportation of the local Jews to the East, and as the head of the Gestapo in Katowice (Poland). His subordinate and head of the Jewish Division in Belgrade was Stracke, who was appointed administrative supervisor of the Sajmište camp.

With the establishment of the camp, SS *Scharführer* Edgar Enge, from the Belgrade Gestapo, was appointed as commandant, in early December 1941. His appointment was seemingly temporary, as his qualifications fell short of SS standards: lack of leadership qualities and education, and a dilatory career in the SS

---

31 In many German documents we find accounts of the disturbing psychological effects of the executions on Einsatzgruppen personnel. Without any doubt it influenced Himmler’s order to find a more ‘human’ method of mass murder. Regarding the psychological effects on German soldiers in Serbia see note 16.

32 Meyszner told his Yugoslav interrogators that Schäfer informed him about the imminent arrival of the gas vans. See ISA 06/1435.
which he had joined by chance. SS Untersturmführer Herbert Andorfer, the permanent camp commander, arrived at Sajmište at the end of January 1942. Andorfer, a lower-middle-class Austrian, was 30 years old when he arrived at Sajmište. He was a high school graduate, but the Depression forced him to leave the university in mid-studies. He then began working in several hotels in Austria. He was a member of the National Socialist party from 1931 and joined the SS in 1934. His clandestine political activities forced him to escape to Germany before the Anschluss. Afterwards, he joined the permanent staff of the Security Police and specialized in combating the black market and in monitoring public opinion, i.e. spying and informing. Prior to his arrival in Yugoslavia, he finished a special course at one of the various SS training camps for Einsatzgruppen in Preču, and was then assigned to a unit of the German Occupation forces in Yugoslavia. Before arriving in Belgrade, he took part in anti-partisan activities. As commandant of Sajmište, Andorfer was confronted with a camp consisting of approximately 6000 inmates, mainly Jewish women and children, and a few hundred Jewish men who survived the autumn 1941 massacres. The men were probably taken from the camp in February and shot. During February 1942, Jewish women and children from the outlying towns in Serbia, such as Smederevo, Niš and Šabac were brought to Sajmište and by the end of the month the number of inmates had grown to 7000. As already mentioned, the German authorities in Serbia abhorred any kind of Jewish presence in their domain and the camp was no exception. Meanwhile, rumours of the ‘Final Solution’ reached Belgrade and hence certain high officials were aware of the events in the East. It was not known who suggested the idea, but the solution was to use a gas van, brought from Berlin, to exterminate the inmates of Sajmište.

Turner’s personal file contains a letter dated 11 April 1942, before the completion of the gasings, addressed to Himmler’s adjutant, Karl Wolff, in which the head of the gassings, addressed to Himmler’s adjutant, Karl Wolff, in which the head

Enge was not an SS man. He joined the Gestapo after his call-up in 1940 because of his unfitness for military duty. His name appears as an observer of the Belgrade Gestapo at one of the mass shootings. See YV TR 10/656, Browning, Fateful Months, p. 76; IMT, NOKW 497 (Lieutenant Lieppe report).

Professor Brauning makes a perceptive sociological distinction between the desk murderers and the actual killers. He writes ‘The murder of the Serbian Jews would be earned out by a typical division of labour between well trained and well educated organizers and the executioners mobilized from Germany’s depressed lower middle class.’ See Browning, Fateful Months, p. 76. Turner, Fuchs and Schäfer came from well-to-do families and had an academic education (law and economics). They had close connections with the high SS leadership. On the other hand Andorfer barely finished high school and his family was hit by the economic depression. His deputy, Enge, was forced to leave school after the sixth grade and was unemployed for two years. See their personal files at the BDC.

Tokom februara 1942, jevrejske žene i deca su iz okolnih gradova Srbije, kao što su Smederevo, Niš i Šabac, dovedeni na Sajmište, pa se broj logoraša do kraja meseca popeo na 7.000. Kao što je već pomenuto, nemačke vlasti u Srbiji uživale su se sve veće vrste jevrejskog prisustva u svojoj blizini, a logor nije bio izuzetak. U međuvremenu, glasine o ‘konačnom rešenju’ stigle su do Beograda i samim tim su određeni visoki zvaničnici bili svesni događaja na Istoku. Nije poznato ko je došao na tu ideju, ali rešenje je bilo korišćenje dušegupke koja je stigla iz Berlina u cilju istrebljenja logoraša na Sajmištu. Turnerov lični dosijef sadrži pismo od 11. aprila 1942, dakle, pre završetka ubijanja gušenjem, upućeno Himlerovom adjuvantu Karlu Volfu, u kome načelnik civilne uprave piše: 35

— 99 —
of the Serbian civil administration writes:

A few months ago I ordered the shooting of all the Jewish males under my command, and the assembling of all the Jewish women and children in the camp. At that time I obtained, with the help of the SD, a delousing van [Entlausungswagen] which shall clean up the camp in a few weeks time.36

Significantly, however, Schäfer, the head of the Belgrade Security Police, related that on the eve of his departure to Belgrade in January 1942, Heydrich personally briefed him and never mentioned Jews. Furthermore, he claimed at his trial after the war that he did not ask Berlin to send the gas van, and upon his arrival in Belgrade, when he heard about the annihilation of the local Jewish men, he was convinced that it was part of the so-called ‘Final Solution’. He was, therefore, not surprised when he received a telegram from Berlin concerning the dispatch of the gas van, nor had he any doubts as to its purpose. The wording, (according to Schäfer) was something like this:

The subject: Jewish action [Judenaktion] in Serbia.
A special detachment [Einsatzkommando] with a Saurer van is on the way for a special action.

Schäfer, who tried at his trial to deny any responsibility for the crimes in which he took part (such as the deportation of the Cologne Jews to the Polish camps), admitted that the telegram about the imminent arrival of the gas van was addressed personally to him and he, naturally, informed his superior, Meyszner.37

This has not enlightened us any further as to the source of the idea of using the gas van, but for the sake of historical accuracy let us briefly address the issue. In a letter to Wolff, Turner states that it was he who pressured to have the gas van sent over. Browning claims that Turner’s assertion was an empty boast used to strengthen his position against his adversaries is valid, but this does not mean he lied concerning the gas van. By examining his past actions it is clear that Turner’s main concern was to get rid of the Serbian Jews and consequently, during the summer and autumn of 1941, he pressured Berlin to deport them to Poland or to Rumania. When this was staunchly refused, he

‘Pre nekoliko meseci naredio sam streljanje svih jevrejskih muškaraca pod svojom komandom i okupljanje svih jevrejskih žena i dece u logoru. Za to vreme sam uz pomoć Službe bezbednosti nabavio kamion za istrebljivanje vaški [Entlausungswagen] koji će očistiti logor kroz nekoliko nedelja’.38

Međutim, načelnik beogradske Policije bezbednosti Šefer je rekao da je uoči dolaska u Beograd u Beogradu u januaru 1942. raportirao lično Hajdrihu, koji tom prilikom ni u jednom trenutku nije pomenuo Jevreje. Pored toga, Šefer je tokom svog sudenja po završetku rata tvrdio da nije tražio kamion od Berlina i da je, kada je stigao u Beograd i čuo za uništenje lokalnih jevrejskih muškaraca, bio ubeden da je to tez ‘konačnog rešenja’. Samim tim, nije bio iznenaden kada je dobio telegram iz Berlina u vezi sa slanjem kamiona, niti je imao bilo kakvih nedoumica u vezi sa njegovom namenom. Telegram (na osnovu Šeferovog iskaza) izgledao je otprilike ovako:

Predmet: Akcija prema Jevrejima (Judenaktion) u Srbiji.
Specijalna jedinica (Einsatzkommando) sa kamionom tipa “zaurer” je na putu, kao deo specijalne akcije.

Šefer, koji je tokom sudenja pokušao da porekne svoju odgovornost za zločine u kojima je učestvovao (kao što je deportacija kelnskih Jevreja u logore u Poljskoj), priznava je da je telegram o skorom pristizanju kamiona bio upućen lično njemu i da je, prirodno, o tome obavestio svoj nadređenog, Majstnera.37


Može se reći da je Turner koristio jevrejsko pitanje za jačanje sopstvene pozicije protiv svog rivala, ali to ne znači da je izašao u vezi sa kamionom. Ubrzo u obzir njegove prethodne aktivnosti, jasno je i da je Turnerova tvrdnja bila fehlende, kako da se reši srpskih Jevreja i Shodno tome, tokom leta i jeseni 1941, vriše je pritisak na Berlin da ih deportuje u Poljsku ili Rumuniju. Kada je to oštro odbijeno,  

36 BDC, Turner file.
37 Ibid., p. 77. Browning writes ‘Turner’s reports to Berlin were often inaccurate and self servin’
38 Ibid., str. 77. Brauning kaže: ‘Turnerovi izveštaji Berlinu su često bili netačni i vođeni ličnim interesima’.
agreed to the *Wehrmacht*s and to the Foreign Office's solution, to have the Jewish males murdered as part of the anti-partisan terrorism. The portrayal by Professor Browning of a vacillating Turner, who lost the fight against the Diadochs in Serbia, is not the same Turner who steadily climbed the SS hierarchy, or the man with such good personal connections in the Nazi leadership.

In his 15-page report to Himmler, written in February 1942, Turner claimed that *Wehrmacht* soldiers in Belgrade 'refused to execute Jews', and he was, therefore, forced to use members of the *Einsatzgruppen* and his own police force. Browning asserts that Turner's claim, in this instance, was totally false. In most cases the *Wehrmacht* soldiers willingly carried out the executions, although at times they refused to do so. In the execution report written by Lieutenant Wälther in October 1941, he states: 'At the start of the executions there was no evidence of emotional disturbances among the soldiers. As time passed, however, these disturbances manifested themselves. It is my personal impression that during the shooting one does not have psychological reactions, but they may set in following reflective evenings alone.' Wälther admitted, in the course of his interrogation after the war, that after three mass shootings he could not carry on because of terrible nightmares, and that he asked to be released from this duty. His request was granted and a police detachment was formed under Turner's jurisdiction, took over. On the whole, it seems as if Turner's statement that the *Wehrmacht* soldiers refused to carry out the shootings was not an empty one, and, hence, it is possible that his claim regarding his initiative in bringing over the gas van may be true. Be that as it may, the lethal van arrived in Belgrade at the end of February 1942, and to all claim regarding his initiative in bringing over the gas van may be true. Be that as it may, the lethal van arrived in Belgrade at the end of February 1942, and to all

---

39 Bundesarchiv Koblenz, NS (Neu) 19-1730.
41 IMT, NOKW 905.
42 Professor Browning investigated Wälther's postwar interrogation files. Apparently Wälther made a career in the Bundeswehr, see Browning, *Fateful Months*, p. 54. A totally different opinion of Turner was given by one of his subordinates during his stay in France. He said: Turner was a very capable man, a lawyer, a party member and an SS man, but of an independent mind.' See David Pryce-Jones, *Paris in the Third Reich* (London: Collins, 1981), p. 252.
43 ISA 06/1435. Meyszner said that he is absolutely sure that only Jews were killed in the gas van. Schäfer and the special detachment received strict orders to use the van only for Jews.

---

pristao je na rešenje Vermahta i Ministarstva spoljnih poslova: pogubljenje svih jevrejskih muškaraca kao deo antipartizanske akcije. 40 Turner kakvog ga je pri-

43 ISA 06/1435. Majsner je rekao da je potpuno siguran da su isključivo Jevreji ubijeni u dušegupke. Šefer i specijalni odred dobili su strogove narednja da kamion koriste samo za Jevreje
that a special gas van arrived in Belgrade and that this van would facilitate the ‘resettlement’ of the Sajmište Jews. He understood that the Jews would be ‘put to sleep’ (eingeschläfert) it was made clear to him that this was a matter of the highest secrecy to the Reich (Geheime Reichsache). In order to facilitate his task, he was given special documents to prevent the guards from searching the van when he crossed the Sava Bridge. It was explained to him that the tasks of unloading and burying the corpses would be assigned to the German police.

Andorfer returned to the camp, assembled the Jewish leaders and informed them that, in the near future, they were all going to be transported to a new camp. The Jews were suspicious and wanted to know more details about the new camp. In order to quiet their fears and to reinforce the deception, Andorfer drew up regulations for the fictitious camp in which he listed the duties and privileges of the inmates. Moreover, to make the hoax more credible, he ordered a doctor or a nurse to accompany every transport to ‘take care of their medical needs’. The attempts made by the remaining inmates to learn about the destination and the fate of the deportees were futile. There is no doubt that Andorfer’s deception was successful. At the start of the gassings many inmates volunteered to be transported, and as they continued the Germans prepared a daily list, with no evidence of dissent. The inmates, in their innocence, were convinced that any change would be an improvement over Sajmište. A Serb prisoner who arrived at Sajmište on 5 May 1942, three days before the end of the gassings and two months after they began, inquired about the fate of some of his Jewish friends from one of the few remaining Jewish girls. She replied: ‘Oh yes, they were here ... not long ago they were sent to Poland. All of us are going there, to a ghetto. We hear that life there is much better than here. The adults will work and we, the children, will study in school. Many have already gone and I am eagerly waiting to join them.’

In early March, before the gassings began, four men from Police Battalion 64, stationed in Belgrade, were sent to the headquarters of the local security police. The four, under the command of a man named Wetter, were ordered to report komora stigao u Beograd, što će omogućiti ‘premeštanje’ Jevreja sa Sajmišta. Razumeo je da će Jevreji biti ‘uspavani’. Naredeno mu je da isprati kampion od logora do mesta sahranjivanja. Tom prilikom mu je objašnjeno da se radi o službenoj tajni Rajha. Da bi ispuniо zadatak, dobio je posebna dokumenta kako bi izbegao pretresanje kamiona dok bude prolazio pored straže na Savskom mostu. Rečeno mu je da će zadatak istovara i sahranjivanja leševa biti dodeljen nemačkoj policiji.

Andorfer se vratio u logor, okupio predstavnike Jevreja i obavestio ih da će uskoro biti premešteni u drugi logor. Jevreji su bili sumnjičavi i želeli su da čuju više detalja o novom logoru. Da bi umirio njihove strahove i obmanuo ih, Andorfer je sačinio pravilnik fiktivnog logora u kojem je nabrojao dužnosti i privilegije zatočenika. Štaviše, da bi prevaru učinio uverljivijom, naložio je da doktor i medicinska sestra prate svaki transport da bi ‘brinuli o zdravstvenim potrebama zatočenika’. Pokušaji preostalih logoraša da saznaju više o svom odredištu i sudbini bili su uzaludni. Andorferova varka je nesumnjivo bila uspešna. Kada su počela gušenja, mnogi logoraši su se dobrovoljno javljali da budu transportovani, a kako su se ona nastavljala, Nemci su ... život mnogo bolji. Odrasli će raditi a mi, deca, ćemo ići u školu. Mnogi su već otišli i jedva čekam da im se pridružim.’

Početkom marta, pre nego što je počelo ubijanje gušenjem, četiri pripadnika 64. Policijskog bataljona stacioniranog u Beogradu, poslata su u centralu lokalne policije bezbednosti. Pod komandom čoveka zvanog Veter, dobili su naređenje

44 Browning, Fateful Months, p. 80; YV TR 10/900, 11-12, 19-20. The Jewish representatives at the camp were two Jewish women named Jarfash and Kraus, both German refugees. Witnesses claim they collaborated with the SS. Prior to their appointment the inmates were represented by two outstanding and dedicated Belgrade Jews, the former deputy head of the Jewish community Emil Deutsch and its secretary Mila Demajo. Both were shot in February 1942. See VII, German Files 27/1-30; Zločini, ed. Levental, p. 26.


the next day to the main prison in town and to take charge of a group of Serbian prisoners. They were told that they were taking part in a highly secret mission. At the prison, seven Serbian prisoners were assigned to these men, and they were provided with a security police truck which took them to the firing range at Avala, some 15 kilometres from town.\(^\text{47}\) Meanwhile, Andorfer took care of the final preparations in the camp. At dawn (the exact date is not clear but apparently it was the first week of March) two trucks arrived at the camp gates. The smaller truck entered the camp and stopped in front of the headquarters, while the bigger truck, which resembled a removal van and was painted dark grey, remained parked near the gate outside the camp. Between 50 and 80 inmates, who had volunteered the previous evening, waited nearby. They gathered their belongings which they had marked beforehand, put them into the small truck, and then proceeded to climb into the big truck. The truck drivers, SS Scharführer Meier and SS Scharführer Götz helped them. The inmates sat down on benches along the width of the truck (witnesses said there were 10 benches). As the last prisoner took his place, the heavy doors were hermetically sealed shut. The drivers took their places in the front seats and the death convoy moved on. Andorfer (and sometimes his deputy Enge) led the way in a small car, followed by the big gas van, with the luggage truck in the rear. After a few hundred metres the convoy stopped. The drivers got out and connected the exhaust pipe to a rubber hose that was inserted at the Belgrade side of the bridge, the convoy stopped while one of the gas van drivers got out and connected the exhaust pipe to a rubber hose that was inserted into the van's interior. The luggage truck left the convoy, while Andorfer and the gas van travelled through Belgrade's main streets in the direction of the Belgrade-Niš highway, as the lethal exhaust gases filled the van and asphyxiated the women and children inside.

The cars arrived at the Avala shooting range after about 20 minutes, where they were received by the Wetter police detachment and their Serbian prisoners. As the gas van manoeuvred its approach to the freshly dug mass graves, Andorfer approached Wetter (the two were previously acquainted when Wetter was stationed at Sajmište on guard duty), related to him what had taken place in the gas van, and ordered him to ensure the safety of the burial area. In the meantime, the back


Posle otprilike 20 minuta, vozila su stigla na strelište na Avali, gde ih je dočekao Veterov policijski odred sa srpskim zaroobljenicima. Dok se dušegupka približavala sveže iskopanim masovnim grobnicama, Andorfer je prišaoVeteru (njih dvojica su se prethodno upoznali dok je Veter bio stacioniran na Sajmištu gde je obavljao dužnost stražara), preneo mu šta se dogodilo u gasnom koridoru i naredio mu da bezbednosno zaštiti mesto sahranjivanja. U međuvremenu, ot-

---

47 Browning, Fateful Months, p. 105. Wetter appears as Karl V.
doors of the van were opened and the dead bodies fell out. The Serbian prisoners threw the bodies into the open grave and buried them, finishing the task in less than an hour. All those involved returned to town in order to proceed with work for the next day.\(^{48}\)

During the unloading of the bodies, another group of Serbian prisoners was present at the firing range and was somehow not referred to by Andorfer or Wetter. These men were accomplices to the gassing procedure, as their task was to dig the graves, but they would leave the area when the convoy approached. After the Liberation one member of that group testified, in December 1944:

I dug the graves for the people who were asphyxiated. We did not cover up the graves ... the other group who was brought daily by the Germans, did that. ... From afar I saw a small German car approaching in which an officer sat. Then came another car, as an escort, and a big well sealed truck out of which came thick smoke...

I dug those graves for two months between March and May in which the suffocated Jews were buried. When our German guards saw the convoy coming they drove us away and we were forbidden to look at the unloading ... In that period we dug about 81 or 82 mass graves such as these ... their capacity was about a hundred corpses each ... only the suffocated Jews were buried there. We dug graves elsewhere for the victims of mass shootings.\(^{49}\)

The gassing procedure became a matter of routine. The big grey van arrived daily at the Sajmište main gate, except on Sundays, and the Jews would climb into the van for their last journey. Sometimes the industrious Germans accomplished two gassings in one day and sometimes a bored Andorfer left the convoy on its way to Avala and took the day off. The SS drivers would kindly distribute sweets among the children, thereby winning their affection. The last Sajmište Jew was killed on 8 May 1942.

The Jewish inmates, as we already know, were totally deceived, but not the people outside the camp. Rumours about the grey death van circulated among the Germans stationed in Belgrade and even reached some Serbs. Most members of the German local administration knew about it and did not deny it at their trials after the war.\(^{50}\) Anywho one who either passed by or worked at the Security Police 

---

\(^{48}\) YV 10/900. Efforts to find the van drivers failed. The two apparently liked children and would give them sweets before helping them climb into the van. At the Andorfer trial there was a lengthy dis-cussion about the location where the drivers connected the exhaust pipe to the truck and about the distance between the camp and the Sava Bridge. The problem could have been easily solved by sending somebody to Belgrade and measuring the distance (which is as a matter of fact a few hundred metres).\(^{49}\)

\(^{49}\) Zločini, ed. Levental, p.32, Milutinović testimony. His assessment of approximately 8000 Sajmište victims corresponds to the numbers in the contemporary documents. See Appendix.

\(^{50}\) Zločini, ed. Levental, pp 32-4. This is parts of Turner’s, Kiesel’s, (Turner’s deputy), Helm’s and Meyszner’s vorena su zadnja vrata kamiona i mrtva tela su ispala napolje. Srpski zarobljenici su ubacili tela u grobnicu i sahranili ih – obavili su taj zadatak za manje od jednog sata. Svi učesnici su se zatim vratile u grad da bi nastavili sa poslom za naredni dan.\(^{48}\)

Tokom istovare tela, na streljistvu je bila prisutna još jedna grupa srpskih zarobljenika koju, iz nepoznatog razloga, nisu pomenuli ni Andorfer ni Veter. Ti ljudi su bili saćesnici u gušenju Jevreja, pošto je njihov zadatak bio da iskopaju grobove, ali su napustili lokaciju dok se konvoj približavao. Nakon oslobođenja, u decembru 1944, jedan od pripadnika ove grupe je svedočio:

‘Kopao sam grobove za ljude koji su ugušeni. Nismo prekrivali grobove...to je činila druga grupa koju su Nemci svakodnevno dovodili...U daljini sam video kako se približava mali nemacki automobil u kome je sedeo oficir. Onda je stigao i drugi automobil kao pratnja i veliki, potpuno zatvoreni kamion iz koga je izlazio gust dim...dva meseca, od marta do maja, kopao sam grobnice u kojima su sahranjeni ugušeni Jevreji. Kada su nemački stražari videli da dolazi konvoj, odvezli su nas i zabranili nam da posmatramo istovar...U tom periodu smo iskopali 81 ili 82 takse masovne grobove...svaka je primala oko sto leševa...tu su sahranjeni samo ugušeni Jevreji. Na drugim mestima smo kopali grobnice za žrtve masovnih streljanja.\(^{49}\)


Jevrejski logoraši, kao što smo već saznali, bili su potpuno obmanuti, ali se to ne može reći za ljude izvan logora. Glasine o sivom kamionu smrti kružile su među Nemcima stacioniranim u Beogradu i čak su stigle i do nekih Srba. Pripadnici lokalne nemacke uprave uglavnom su bili upoznati i nisu to negirali tokom sudenja po završetku rata.\(^{50}\) Svako ko je prošao pored ili bio zapo...
Headquarters could see the gas van in the courtyard being cleaned every day of the
excrement of the murdered Jews. The members of the German unit talked
freely among themselves about their duty and, hence, the information reached
the local German nationals, the Serbian police and private citizens.\textsuperscript{13} At this stage,
feeling assured of an imminent victory in the war, the Germans seemingly did
not care about keeping this a secret. Obviously, an unusual truck making daily
trips through Belgrade’s main streets, and out of which came muffled cries, would
arouse a certain amount of curiosity and suspicion. On the last day of the gassings,
a group of high-ranking Belgrade SS officers arrived at the shooting range at
Avala. When the last gas van of human cargo arrived and the bodies were buried
and disposed of, the seven Serbians of the burial detachment stood alongside
the graves and listened as the officers read the decree to have them shot. They
were shot and buried, although it is unclear who did the actual shooting. Were
the Belgrade bureaucrats eager to participate at least once in the real shootings,
or did they stand by and watch the policemen and Enge shoot the men? West
German courts discussed this matter thoroughly and could not reach a definitive
conclusion.\textsuperscript{52}

At the end of the gassings, a few persons remained in the camp, mostly non-
Jewish women who were married to Jews. They were released after a few days and
sworn to secrecy. Another group of Jews, of German origin (probably of the Šabac
or Banat groups), stayed for a few days to complete the clerical work, and they,
too, were shot by the end of May 1942.\textsuperscript{51}

In addition to the Sajmište inmates, patients and the staff of the Belgrade Jewish
Hospital, as well as Jewish prisoners of the nearby Banjica concentration camp
were killed in the gas van. The 500 patients and the Jewish hospital staff were
murdered on 19 and 20 March 1942. On the night of 19 March, the doctors and
nurses were arrested in their homes and brought to the hospital on Veliki Stevan
Street, while at the same time the sick Jews who were hospitalized at the small
infirmary in the Oneg Shabbat building on Kosma-jaka Street, were brought there
slen in Glavnom štabu Policije bezbednosti, mogao je da vidi kako se u dvorištu
dušegupka čisti od izmeta ubijenih Jevreja. Pripadnici nemačke jedinice su među sobom slobodno pričali o svojoj dužnosti, tako da je informacija stigla do
lokalnih stanovnika nemačke nacionalnosti, srpske policije i običnih građana.\textsuperscript{53}
Nemci, koji su u tom periodu bili sigurni u skoru pobedu u ratu, nisu se trudili
da čuvaju tajnu. Jaso je da je neobični kamion koji svakodnevno prolazi glavnim ulicama Beograda i iz koga dopiru prigušeni vrapci izazvao određenu pažnju i
sumnjičavost. Poslednjeg dana gušenja, grupa visokorangiranih beogradskih
oficira SS-a stigla je na strelište na Avali. Kada je stigao poslednji kamion sa
jedinskim tovarom i kada su tela zakopana, sedan Srba iz odreda za sahranje
vànja stajalo je pored grobnica i slušalo dok su oficiri čitali naredbu o njihovom
streljanju. Oni su ubijeni i sahranjani, iako ostaje nejasno ko je izvršio streljanje.
Da li su beogradske birokrate bile željne da maked jednom učestvuju u pravom
streljanju ili su stajale pored i gledale kako policajci i Enge streljuju ove ljude?
Sudovi Zapadne Nemačke su detaljno raspravljali o ovom slučaju, ali nisu mogli
dañesu konačan zaključak.\textsuperscript{52}

Posle završetka ubijanja gušenjem, nekoliko osoba je ostalo u logoru, uglavnom nejvečke koje su bile uđete za Jevreje. Obavezane na čitanje, puštene
je posle nekoliko dana. Ostali Jevreji, nemačkog porekla (verovatno iz Šapca ili
Banata), zadržali su nekoliko dana da završe administrativne poslove, pa su
zatim i oni streljani do kraja maja 1942. godine.\textsuperscript{53}

Pored logoraša sa Sajmišta, u dušegupki su ubijeni i pacijenti i osoblje Beo-
gradske jevrejske bolnice, kao i jevrejski zarobljenici obližnji koncentracijskog
logora na Banjici. Pet stotina pacijenata i članova osoblja jevrejske bolnice ubije
jedan, 19. i 20. marta 1942. godine. U noći 19. marta, doktori i medicinske sestre
sastali su se u svojim domovima i dovedeni u bolnicu u Ulici Stevana Velikog, a
u isto vreme su dovedeni i bolesni Jevreji koji su ležali u maloj ambulanti u zgradi
Oneg Shašte u Kosmajskoj ulici. U bolnici je bilo zarobljeno ukupno 700 ljudi.

\textsuperscript{51} Browning, Fateful Months, pp. 82-3.

\textsuperscript{52} Enge claimed at his trial that he did not shoot those Serbian prisoners. He added that at that particular moment he was sent to fetch something for one of the SS officers, so he could not see who did the killings. Wetter said that the van driver Götz did it. It is obvious that everybody tried to accuse somebody else. See YV TR 10/656, 4-7. Testimony by a Serb witness, Zločini, ed. Levental, p. 32.

\textsuperscript{53} See notes 20 and 46. In the Kompanjec testimony there is a very impressive story about a Jewish girl leading the group proudly to their death.

i Majners pred jugoslovenskim vlastima. Integralne verzije protokola su zavedene kao službena tajna u VII.

\textsuperscript{52} Browning, Fateful Months, str. 82-3.


\textsuperscript{53} Vidi Napomene 20 i 46. Svedočenje Kompanjec sa svedočnim priču o jevrejskoj devojčici koja je ponosno predvodila grupu u smrt.
as well. A total of 700 people were held captive in the hospital. As the morning of 19 March dawned, relatives and acquaintances who had heard of the internment gathered near the hospital but were held at bay by the German guards surrounding the entire area. The gas van arrived towards noon and the loading began. Eyewitnesses described the appalling scene: enfeebled and sick people, blind men and invalids were dragged, pushed and beaten by callous soldiers. People on stretchers were thrown into the van. The Germans were shouting: 'Los, los!' (go on, go on!), moans and cries, and desperate calls of farewell reached the bystanders. This scene was repeated many times in the next three or four days, as the grey van made its rounds to and from the burial grounds at Avala.

We have only one testimony which describes the murder of the Jewish prisoners at the Banjica camp, where the majority of the inmates were members of the resistance movement, although Jews who were caught hiding throughout Serbia were also brought there. The Germans, it seems, decided not to transport the Jews of Banjica to Sajmište, and twice during the spring of 1942, according to the witness, the gas van was used to murder the Jews at the site of the Banjica camp. The killings were done under the supervision of the chief SS medical officer in Belgrade, the infamous Dr. Jun.

The gas van was returned to Berlin only on 9 June, even though the gassings ended on 9 May. Schäfer sent a telegram to SS Sturmbannführer Friedrich Pradel, the head of the motor vehicle pool at the RSHA headquarters:

The subject: Special Saurer type van.

The drivers ... Götz and Meier finished their special assignment. They are returning with the van. Because of damage in the rear part of the van ... I ordered its transportation by train.

Seemingly, the return of the gas van was delayed because of repair work attempted by SS mechanics in Belgrade.

Kada je osvanulo jutro 19. marta, rođaci i poznanici koji su čuli za internaciju okupili su se u blizini bolnice, ali su nemački strażari okopili celo područje i držali ih na odstojanju. Dušegupka je stigla oko podneva i utovarivanje je počelo. Svedoci opisuju strašan prizor: bezosećajni vojnici su vukli, gurali i tukli iznurene i bolesne ljude, slepe i invalide. Ljudi na nosilima su ubacivani u kamion. Nemci su vikali: 'Los, los!' (hajde, hajde!) a krisci, jauci i očajni pozdravi su dopirali do okupljenih ljudi. Ova scena je ponovljena mnogo puta tokom na-redna tri ili četiri dana kada je sivi kamion vozio do grobnice na Avali i nazad.

Imamo samo jedno svedočenje koje opisuje ubijanje jevrejskih logoraša na Banjici, gde su uglavnom dovođeni pripadnici pokreta otpora, ali i Jevreji koji su hapšeni tokom skrivanja širom Srbije. ... iz logora na Banjici. Ubistva su počinjena pod nadzorom oficira medicinske službe SS-a u Beogradu, zloglasnog dr. Junga.

Iako su se ubistva u dušegupki okončala 9. maja, ona je vraćena u Berlin tek 9. juna. Šefer je poslao telegram SS šturmbanfireru Fridrihu Pradelu, načelniku voznog parka pri Glavnom štabu Glavne uprave bezbednosti Rajha:


Iako su se ubistva u dušegupki okončala 9. maja, ona je vraćena u Berlin tek 9. juna. Šefer je poslao telegram SS šturmbanfireru Fridrihu Pradelu, načelniku voznog parka pri Glavnom štabu Glavne uprave bezbednosti Rajha:

Seemingly, the return of the gas van was delayed because of repair work attempted by SS mechanics in Belgrade.

Zločini, ed. Levental, pp. 36-7.
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CONCLUSIONS

Andorfer and Enge were transferred to a different Security Police assignment some time after the annihilation of the Sajmište Jews, an accomplishment for which Andorfer was decorated with the Iron Cross, second class, and for which he received a promotion. The Sajmište camp became a concentration camp for thousands of Serbian prisoners, where they were tortured and killed, or deported to camps in Germany or other Occupied areas.

The German high command in Serbia considered the total annihilation of the local Jews as a feather in their cap. In his report to the newly appointed German commander in the Balkans, Harald Turner wrote in August 1942: ‘Serbia is the only country in Europe where the Jewish problem has been solved.’57 In a private conversation in 1942, the head of the Belgrade Security Police, Emanuel Schäfer, boasted that ‘Belgrade is the only major European city cleansed of Jews.’58

The wholesale murder of the European Jews, the ‘Final Solution’, was a tightly kept secret known to only a few people. Despite the involvement of many people in the implementation of various aspects of the ‘Final Solution’, most were unaware of the total scheme. When the leaders of the Third Reich began to doubt the certainty of their military victory, they began to destroy evidence of their crimes against the Jews. Consequently, SS Standartenführer Paul Blobel, who served in the Einsatzgruppen and was in charge of the notorious mass murder of the Jews of Kiev at Babi Yar, was in June 1942 appointed commander of ‘Kommando 1005’ whose task was to locate the mass graves of the Jews who were murdered throughout the Nazi empire. It was his responsibility to exhume the graves, burn the bodies and erase all traces of mass killings, primarily in Poland and Russia where the major massacres took place.59

Blobel arrived in Belgrade in November 1943, and ordered the head of the local Gestapo, SS Sturmbannführer Sattler, to form a special detachment to perform the exhumation and the burning of the bodies of those who were murdered in Serbia and buried in mass graves. The task was accomplished by 10 security policemen, led by SS Untersturmführer Sack, together with 48 German military policemen.

ZAKLUČAK

Andorfer and Enge were prebačeni na druge zadatke Policije bezbednosti neko vreme posle uništenja Jevreja sa Sajmišta, za šta je Andorfer odlikovan Gvozdenim krstom druge klase i unapređen. Sajmište je pretvoreno u specijalni logor za hiljade srpskih zatočenika koji su mučeni i ubijani ili deportovani u logore u Nemačkoj ili u drugim okupiranim oblastima.


Blobel je stigao u Beograd u novembru 1943. i naredio načelniku lokalog Gestapoa, SS Sturmbannfreier Sattleru, da formira specijalni odred koji će izvršiti ekshumaciju i spaljivanje tela sahranjениh u masovnim grobnicama u Srbiji. Taj zadatak je obavio deset pripadnika Policije bezbednosti pod komandom SS untersturmfirera Zaka, zajedno sa 48 nemačkih vojnih policajaca pod koman-
under the command of Lieutenant Erich Grunwald. The digging battalions consisted of 100 Serbian prisoners and Jews (the Jews were brought from the Dalmatian coast which was captured by the Germans after the Italian surrender in September 1943). From December 1943 to April 1944 the digging unit exhumed thousands of bodies at the Jajince shooting range (Avala), and then proceeded to other areas in Serbia. All the prisoners from the digging unit were shot after their job was completed, except for three Serbs who miraculously escaped. One of these survivors reported after the war: ‘While excavating the bodies of the women and children [from the Sajmište inmates’ graves — M.S.], I noticed that they were not shot. Their bodies had no trace of bullet holes or wounds. ... In the graves, there were no traces of blood such as we saw in other mass graves.’ The bodies were piled up and burned. The ashes were collected and scattered in the nearby river, and by Blobel’s order, the valuables found in the graves were sent to the Criminal Department at the RSHA Headquarters in Berlin.

It is difficult to establish the exact number of people murdered in the gassings at Sajmište, but a conservative estimate is 8000 persons, mainly women and children (see Appendix). The majority of Germans who were involved in the Sajmište murders were brought to trial. The Allies extradited Harald Turner, August Meyszner and Wilhelm Fuchs to Yugoslavia where they were executed. Emanuel Schäfer managed to conceal his identity until the mid-1950s, and was then brought to trial before a West German court where he was sentenced to six-and-a-half years in prison. The verdict was mainly based on his participation in the deportation of the Jews from Cologne to Poland. Herbert Andorfer, the commandant of Sajmište, managed to escape (probably with the help of the Church) to Venezuela. He worked there under a false name until the beginning of the 1960s, when he returned to Austria and worked under his original name in a tourist agency. In the wake of the gas van trials, and after his deputy Enge was tried in 1967, Andorfer was finally apprehended. The Austrian courts refused to try him, under the pretext that he was a Venezuelan citizen, but the German Federal Government intervened and brought him to trial in Dortmund in 1968. He was convicted of the relatively minor charge of accessory to murder and sentenced to two-and-a-half years of imprisonment. He was freed after the trial because the court took

61 Zločini, ed. Levental, p. 43, Damjanović testimony.
62 VII, German Files 24-1-2/8; Kreso, Njemačka okupaciona uprava u Beogradu, p 210
63 YV TR 10/219.

into account his pre-trial Austrian incarceration. Andorfer stayed in prison one day for every 10 murdered Jews.

Andorfer’s deputy, Enge, was arrested at the end of the war but was not put on trial. After his liberation from a prisoner-of-war camp he lived as a law-abiding citizen until he was apprehended in 1965, freed once again and then brought to trial in 1968. He was convicted of the charge of accessory to murder, as Andorfer was, and sentenced to one-and-a-half years in prison. His sentence was never carried out because of his old age and poor health. The German guards who served at the burial ground appeared in several West German trials as witnesses, but were themselves never put on trial, in spite of the fact that they were suspected of having participated in the execution of the Serbian prisoners.

The Sajmište episode is not of central significance in the historiography of the Holocaust, but it can serve to clarify certain problems. First, the role of the gas van in the murder process: one historian has noted that this was a ‘technological curiosity of the “Final Solution”’. Nevertheless, these lethal vans were responsible for the murder of tens of thousands of human beings. Secondly, as Browning points out, this clearly illustrates the division of labour in the implementation of the Final Solution between the ‘desk murderers’, i.e. the bureaucrats, and those who did the actual killing, such as Andorfer and Turner. Finally the Sajmište killings are central to the history of the Holocaust in Serbia. The majority of the Jewish women and children were killed in that forsaken place, so close to the teeming centre of the Yugoslav capital, and yet so far from the conscience of her citizens In full view of the world, these women and children were tortured and then murdered; their bodies were removed from the grave and their ashes scattered. These words are their only token of remembrance.

...
Pierre Nora

Reasons for the Current Upsurge in Memory

We are witnessing a world-wide upsurge in memory. Over the last twenty or twenty-five years, every country, every social, ethnic or family group, has undergone a profound change in the relationship it traditionally enjoyed with the past.

This change has taken a variety of forms: criticism of official versions of history and recovery of areas of history previously repressed; demands for signs of a past that had been confiscated or suppressed; growing interest in „roots“ and genealogical research; all kinds of commemorative events and new museums; renewed sensitivity to the holding and opening of archives for public consultation; and growing attachment to what in the English-speaking world is called „heritage“ and in France „patrimoine“. However they are combined, these trends together make up a kind of tidal wave of memorial concerns that has broken over the world, everywhere establishing close ties between respect for the past - whether real or imaginary - and the sense of belonging, collective consciousness and individual self-awareness, memory and identity.

France was quite possibly the first to embark on this age of ardent, embattled, almost fetishistic „memorialism“. It was followed, after the fall of the Berlin Wall and the collapse of the Soviet Union, by the „recovery of roots“ and „recovery of memory“ of post-communist Europe. With a slight twist in the chronology, it could be argued that 1975 was the signal moment when the after-effects of the economic crisis, the fallout from the post-de Gaulle era, and the exhaustion of the revolutionary idea most visibly encountered one another.

The economic crisis, unleashed in 1974 by the huge rise in oil prices, affected all industrialised countries. France, however, felt it all the more acutely because the crisis put an end to thirty years of accelerated growth and intensive industrialisation and urbanisation, which had mercilessly swept away an entire set of traditions, landscapes, jobs, customs, and life styles that had long remained unchanged in France, more so than in any of its industrial neighbours. This reversal in growth forced France to recognise not only the damage caused by progress but also the uprooting of what until the Second World War had remained its foundation—in particular, the profound, centuries-old stability of the rural society.

Sociologists and historians had been writing about the end of the peasantry for fifteen years, but its demise suddenly became almost tangible and as painful as an amputation. It was the end of the prototypical „collective memory“. In 1975, the percentage of the population actively engaged in

Pjer Nora

Procvat Sećanja

Živimo u doba globalnog procvata sećanja. Proteklih dvadeset pet godine svugde, u svim zemljama, svim društvima i etničkim grupama primetna je duboka promena tradicionalnog odnosa prema prošlosti.

Ova promena javlja se u mnoštvu oblika: u vidu kritike zvaničnog predstavljanja istorije i ponovnog buđenja potisnutih elemenata istorijskih zbivanja; u vidu potrage za znakima počivne prošlosti; u vidu kritičkog senzibiliteta prema nepristupačnosti arhiva i njihovom otvaranju za javnost; u vidu uspostavljanja novih veza prema nasleđu, koje se na anglosaksonskom govornom području naziva heritage, kod Francuska patrimoine, kod Nemaca Erbe. Kako god da se ovi elementi kombiniraju, čini se da je čitav svet poplavio talas sećanja i svugde stvorilo blisko vezu između (stvarne ili imaginarnice) odanosti prošlosti i osećanja pripadnosti, između kolektivne svesti i individualnog samopoimanja, između sećanja i identiteta.

Francuska je kao prva zemlja ušla u era pasioniranih, skoro kompulzivnih pomena punih konfliktog naboja. Zatim se nakon pada zida i raspada Sovjetskog Saveza javilo i „novootkrivene sećanje“ istočne Evrope. Nakon što su srušene diktature u latinskoj Americi i južnoafričkom apartheidju i Komisiji za istinu i pomirenje došao kraj, postala je primetna prva globalizacija sećanja i razvili su se višestranji, ali svakako uporedivi oblici saočavanja prošlosti. Osobenosti položaja u kom se Francuska nalazi, a koji želim da elaboriram na samom početku, proizlaze iz spoja triju suštinski značajnih fenomena iz sredine 70-ih godina, i to naizgled međusobno nezavisnih fenomena, no čije se dejstvo povezalo na takav način da se istorijska svest u Francuskoj pretvorila u svest o sećanju. Mogli bismo postaviti još preciznije vremenski okvir i 1975. godinu definisati kao prekret, budući da se tada najjasnije preklapaju posledice ekonomske krize, nakon De Golove ere i posustajanje revolucionarnih ideja.

Privredna kriza, izazvana naglim skokom cene naftnih točaka 1974. godine, pogodila je sve industrijalizovane zemlje u svetu. No za Francusku je to bio utoliko teži udarac, što je nakon više od trideset godina ubrzanog razvoja, intenzivne industrijalizacije i urbanizacije ovo označilo kraj dotadašnjeg uspona i kao dojava za sobom povukli čitav splet tradicije, predela, sindikata, običaja i načina života, koji se dugo – i to u Francuskoj daleko duže nego u bilo kojoj drugoj susednoj, takođe industrijalizovanoj zemlji – nisu menjali. Pad standarda Francuskoj ne samo je da je u trenu predio čuvenu štetu koju je napredak bio nanio, već i konačna otuđenost od onoga što je nakon Drugog svetskog rata predstavljalo njenu bazu i osnovu, a posebno gubitak neoborive, hiljadugodišnje stabilnosti seoskog i poljoprivrednog temelja.

Sociologii i istoričari već su skoro petdeset godina predvidali nestanak zemljoradnika, no najdared je bilo skoro fizički osetno i bolno poput amputacije: u pitanju je kraj „kolektivnog sećanja“par excellence. Upravo je 1975. godine kvota predstavnika poljoprivredne delatnosti
agriculture fell below 10 per cent, a fateful threshold. In 1945, right after the Second World War, it had still been about 40 per cent. That was the year when the unexpected and meteoric success of a series of books - such as Pierre-Jaques Héliaès' Le Cheval d'orgueil, the chronicle of a traditional Breton village; Emmanuel Le Roy Ladurie's Montaillou, village occitan; and Georges Duby and Armand Wéron's L'Histoire de la France rurale - made it obvious that “rural memory” existed only through emotional or scholarly education. The ending of the rural era, soon accompanied by the ending of the mass in Latin, cut the umbilical cord that still connected France to what Jacques Le Goff has called the long Middle Ages of France and led to the growing popular success enjoyed ever since by the Middle Ages and its monuments.

It is not unreasonable to suggest that the accession of Valéry Giscard d’Estaing to the presidency in 1974 reinforced this implantation of the imaginary. Here was a brilliant young economist from the upper bourgeoisie, a European at heart, in favor of „relaxing” political life, who began his term of office under the banner of „change”. What kind of rooted France did he embody? The accelerated pace of the new presidency, deliberately technocratic and Parisian, may not have been at odds with France’s enthusiastic plunge into the lost and recovered past, the emerging effects of which were just becoming widespread when, to everyone’s surprise, 1980 became the year the President of the Republic proposed to dedicate himself to the national heritage.

The arrival of Giscard d’Estaing heightened the effects of the post-de Gaulle period and marked a sharp break with the Gaullist tradition in all areas. This second major phenomenon produced numerous effects, powerful as they were insidious, which deserve deeper exploration. Concerning the reinterpretation of the national past, they manifested themselves in three waves of different duration.

The first was short. General de Gaulle’s death in November 1970 put a quick end to the prevailing version of the Resistance – imposed when Paris was liberated by de Gaulle – according to which the entire French nation, with the exception of a handful of traitors and lost souls, resisted the German occupation. The emergence of the dark memory of Vichy France, which was to become a preoccupation, was merited by the official history.

The second wave was longer. The post-de Gaulle period represented a return to a more distant past. The survival of the institutions of the Fifth Republic – though tailored for the General then adopted by François Mitterrand as soon as he came to power, though he had opposed them when in opposition – confirmed the suspicion that de Gaulle had won his historic gamble by restoring the balance among state institutions that the fall of the absolute monarchy had disrupted at the time the Revolution. It was a presentiment that François Furet, for example, conveyed in a famous sentence from his book Penser la Révolution française: „The French Revolution is over.” By the same token, the last two centuries were reinserted into the long continuity of the nation-state. pala ispod sudbounskih deset posto, dok je nedugo posle rata još uvijek skoro polovina radnog stanovništva potpala pod ovu kategoriju. Iste te godine neočekivani, siloviti uspeh pojedinih knjiga – među njima su Konj gordosti, hronika tradicionalnog sela u Bretanji, autora Pjer- Žakea Elijasa, Montajo, selo u Okitainju Emanuelu la Rua-Ladorjia i Istorija sela u urednicištvu Žorža Dubija i Armande Valona – otkriva „sako sećanje”, koje opstaje jedino još posredstvom empatičkog ili naučnog prikaza. Kraj ruralnog razdoblja, nakon kog će ubrzo uslediti i kraj mise na latinskom jeziku, predstavlja istinski lom: Time je presećena pupčana vrpca koja je Francusku spaja sa njenim, prema rečima istoričara Zaka le Gofa, „dužim, veoma dugim srednjim vekom”, a to će biti osnova za veliki uspeh koji srednji vek i srednjovekovne građevine od tog trenutka uživaju kod publike, kroz kojeg i ne jejenja.


Činjenica da je Žiskar Desten nakon preuzimanja funkcije jasno prekinuo svaku golističku tradiciju sigurno je ojačala uticaj postgolizma, drugog fenomena širokih razmera. Taj uticaj, manifešten na razne načine i jednako močan koliko je i pritajen, nije ni izbliza dovoljno ispitano. A što se tiče nove interpretacije nacionalne istorije, ona se, šematski prikazano, razvila u tri smera.

„Oslabioćeva” smrt je u novembru 1970. godine kratkoročno dovela do naglog kraja zvanice i važece „verzije otpora” u ratnim zbivanjima, koja je De Gol objavio nakon ološebanja Pariza, a prema kojoj su se svi Francuzi, osim nekoliko izdajnika ili onih koji se našli u zabludi, uspratili nemakom okupacijom. Tri faktora obično se vezuju za mračna sećanja na Francusku iz doba režima u Višiju, na „prošlost koja nikako da prođe”, kako se u međuvremenu skoro poslovilo, a to su: šok kojim je udruženje nekadašnjih pripadnika Pokreta otpora reagovalo na to što je predsednik Pompidou 1971. godine pomoljavao rezervu Tuvijac, film režesa Marsela Ofila Čemer i jad (1971), koji je dospeo na crnu listu, a prikazuje Francusku u daleko manje herojskom svetu i prevod na francuski jezik dela Roberta O. Pakstona Francuska u vreme Višija (1973), koje se ograđuje od zvanice istorije.

The entire monarchical past was reevaluated positively, and, contrary to all expectations, the improbable millennium of Hugues Capet in 1987, which preceded the fifteen hundredth anniversary of Clovis in 1996, was a popular success, based on the theme that France is a thousand years old!

Still more generally, the rise of nation's last great figure to his zenith reinvigorated the entire pantheon. It was impossible not to make a connection between the exaltation of the „great man” and the return of a historical biography, a flourishing genre in these years after long neglect, and a renewed sensibility of the French for „a certain idea of France”, not only for its history but also for its landscape, its cuisine, its fields, and its traditions. This sensibility accounted for the rapid rise of the extreme right and Jean-Marie Le Pen's National Front. For the left, it meant that their concern for the nation had regained its legitimacy - a legitimacy which, thanks to the decline of the revolutionary idea, served to emphasise that Marxism had run aground.

The third phenomenon, less perceptible but perhaps of greater importance, contributed powerfully to the remodelling of the French attitudes toward their own past. The major events of those years included the intellectual collapse of Marxism; the falling of the Soviet Union into total disrepute; the rapid decline of the Communist party, which just a few years before was still mobilising about a quarter of the electorate; and the eclipse of the party's influence on most of the French intelligentsia. To complete the picture, the year 1975 saw the enormous success of the French translation of Alexander Solzhenitsyn's Gulag Archipelago. Here too the phenomenon extended well beyond national boundaries, but it was highlighted by the existence of a strong Communist party that was still profoundly Stalinist. In a country like France, the home, the mother of revolutions since 1789, the end of the revolutionary idea, which had been the most potent vector directing historical times toward the future, could only lead to a rapid transformation in feelings about the past. In a concept of time organised around revolutions, it was clear what had to be retained from the past in order to prepare the future. It was clear as well what parts must be suppressed, forgotten, and destroyed if need be. Historical time of the revolutionary type is informed by the desire for rupture. The devaluation of the notion of rupture that accompanied the decline of the revolutionary idea restored legitimacy to the idea of tradition. Not a tradition of which we would be the heirs and sustainers (as in the revolutionary mode), but a tradition from which we would be forever separated, one that would thereby become precious, mysterious, and imbued with an uncertain meaning, which was our task to recover. The meteoric rise of the cult of national heritage has no other source. Its secret? The disappearance of historical time oriented by the revolutionary idea restored to the past its freedom, its indetermination, its stature-both material and immaterial.

Together, these three phenomena, not the only ones but surely the most powerful, were soon promoting the idea of a national „memory”. Though the idea dates back only about thirty years, it has grown with embellishment. This „memorialist” trend, for which I have suggested the name „the age of commemoration”, is so widespread, so deep-seated and all-powerful, that it may be worthwhile - at the risk of confining oneself to generalisations or trivialities - trying to understand the reasons for it. This upsurge in memory intersects, its seems to me, with two major historical phenomena which have marked the age, one temporal and one social. It is these two phenomena that I would like to underline and present for discussion today.


Još uopštenije rečeno, uzdizanje poslednje velike ličnosti francuske nacije na pijedestal osvežilo je i čitatelju galeriju velikana. Ne možemo a da ne pomenemo ponovno isticanje „velikog čoveka” u kontekstu povratak istorijskoj biografiji, dugo prekrivenu žanru koji u poslednje vreme iznova sredstva. Isto tako ne možemo a da ovo na dubljenim nivovima povezovati sa jednim drugim efektom, naime sa novim senzibilitetom koji Francuzi pokazuju prema „određenoj predstavi o Francuskoj“, dakle ne više samo prema istoriji zemlje, već i prema njenim predelima, kuhinji, prema rodnoj grudi i tradiciji. No koliko god bi se ovim novim senzibilitetom adekvatno mogao objasniti nagli uspon ekstremne desnice i Nacionalnog fronta Žan-Maria le Pena, njega je zapravo i levica podržala iz novonastale brige za naciju – ova činjenica rado se koristi kako bi se slabljennjem revolucionarnih ideja istakao neuspelh markizma.

Upravo je to treći fenomen, manje opipljiv ali možda utoliko značajniji, koji je suštinski doprinio formiranju drugačijeg stava o vlastitoj istoriji kod francuskog naroda. Intellektualna propast markizma, radikalna diskreditacija Sovjetskog Saveza, naglo slabljennje Komunističke partije, koja je nekoliko godina pre toga uspeh da zadobije i do četvrtine biračkog tela, kao i jenovanje harzime francuske inteligencije glavni su događaji ovog doba. Da bismo značajno značajniji fenomen značajniji fenomen 1500. jubileja 1996. godine – kao pravo narodno veselje pod sloganom Francuska slavi hiljaditi rođendan! - 112 -
The first concerns what is usually referred to as the „acceleration of history“. This notion, first put forward by Daniel Halévy, essentially means that the most continuous or permanent feature of the modern world is no longer continuity or permanence but change. And increasingly rapid change, an accelerated precipitation of all things into an ever more swiftly retreating past. We must take the measure of this change for the way in which memory is organised. It is of crucial importance, for it has shattered the unity of historical time, that fine, straightforward linearity which traditionally bound the present and the future to the past.

In effect, it was the way in which a society, nation, group or family envisaged its future that traditionally determined what it needed to remember of the past to prepare that future; and this in turn gave meaning to the present, which was merely a link between the two. Broadly speaking, the future could be interpreted in one of three ways, which themselves determined the image people had of the past. It could be envisaged as a form of restoration of the past, a form of progress or a form of revolution. Today, we have discarded these three ways of interpreting the past, which made it possible to organise a „history“. We are utterly uncertain as to what form the future will take. And because of this uncertainty, the present – which, for this very reason no doubt, now has a battery of technical means at its disposal for preserving the past – puts us under an obligation to remember.

We do not know what our descendants will need to know about ourselves in order to understand their own lives. And this inability to anticipate the future puts us under an obligation to stockpile, as it were, in a pious and somewhat indiscriminate fashion, any visible trace or material sign that might eventually testify to what we are or what we will have become. In other words, it is the end of any kind of teleology of history – the end of a history whose end is known – that places on the present this urgent „duty to remember“ ( devoir de mémoire ) that is so much talked about. Unlike my friend Paul Ricoeur, who keeps his distance from this hackneyed phrase, preferring that of „effort to remember“ ( travail de mémoire ), I am willing to accept the term, provided it is understood in a much broader sense than is usually attributed to it, a sense more mechanical, material and heritage-based than moral, and linked, not to the idea of „debt“ but of „loss“, which is a very different matter.

For the other effect of this „acceleration of history“, symmetrical with that of the future, is to abruptly distance us from the past – we are cut off from it. It has shattered the unity of historical time, that fine, straightforward linearity which traditionally bound the present and the future to the past. The „acceleration of history“, then, has two effects on memory:

- on the one hand, it leads to a kind of stockpiling, bound up with this feeling of loss and responsible for the exaggerated importance now attached to memory and the proliferation of institutions and instruments that relate to it: museums, archives, libraries, collections, digitalized

Prvi fenomen vezuje se za takozvano „ubrzanje istorije“. Pod ovom formulacijom Daniela Alevija podrazumevamo da ono što posuđuje najveći kontinuitet i trajnosti upravo više nije ukorenjeno u tom kontinuitetu i trajnosti, već u promenljivosti: u promenljivosti koja sve više dobija na tempu i koja sve većim ubrzanjem sve izmešta u daleku prošlost. Mora nam biti jasno šta ovakav preokret zapravo znači. On presudno utiče na uspostavljanje sećanja. Kao pod dejstvom eksplozivne naprave rasprišeno je jedinstvo istorijskog vremena, tina i jednostavna linearnost koja je spajala sadašnjost sa budućnošću.

Sve do tog trenutka predstava koju neka proizvoljna zajednica – nacija, grupa ili porodica – gaju o vlastitoj budućnosti bila je presudna za odluku šta će iz prošlosti sačuvati kako bi oblikovali željenu budućnost, a samim tim šta će sadašnja, koja je vršila samo funkciju spone, dati smisao. Šematski rečeno postojala su tri obrasca po kojima bismo mogli zamišljati budućnost, a koji su opet definisali i prošlost: budućnost možemo zamišljati kao neku vijetu, ponovnom uspostavljanju prošlosti, kao nepredrak ili kao neki viđ revolucije. Danas se više ne oslanjamo na ovo tri šematska prikaza, koji nam omogućavaju da „istoriju“ organizujemo na različite načine. Šta će biti od budućnosti pod teretom je potpune neizvesnosti. Upravo ta neizvesnost obavezuje sadašnjost (kojoj su na raspolaganju do sada nepoznate tehničke mogućnosti skladštiranja) na sećanje. Ne znamo šta će naši potomci jednog dana morati da znaju o nama kako bi razumeli same sebe. Upravo usled naše neznanje – a u pitanju je upravo to – moramo da anticipiрамo budućnost, u situaciji samoo mržnju da dosti neizdeženo, rencirano ali sasvim prikupimo sve vidljive tragove i materijalne dokaze, koji će jednog dana (možda) svedočiti o tome šta smo bili ili šta ćemo biti. Drugim rečima: Kraj svekolike istorijske teleologije, tji. kraj istorije čiji nam je ishod poznat, nameće sadašnja nezbenznu „dužnost da se seca“, o kojoj je toliko govori. Za razliku od Pola Ricera, koji se distancirao od ove otrcane fraze i umesto nje predlaže izraz „proces sećanja“, ja sam spreman da ih prihvatom, no jedino pod uslovom da joj se dodeli daleko širi smisao od onoga koji joj se obično pripisuje: smisao koji će biti znatno opsežniji, mehaničkiji, materijalniji i patrimonijalniji od sadašnjeg etičkog značenja. Smisao koji se neće vezivati za krivicu, već za gubitak, a to je nešto posve drugačije.

Ubrzanje „istorije“ nezamoljivo i u skladu sa njegovim uticajem na budućnost dolazi do udaljavanja od prošlosti, te smo i mi osobečeni od nje. Iz našeg ugla gledanja prošlost je izgubljena, ona je „the world we have lost“, da citiramo poznatu izjavu jednog engleskog istoričara. To je dakle svet u kom više ne živimo i koji nam je namenjen samo za pokušaj rekonstrukcije sadašnjeg, koja nam je uopšteno poznata. Ako bi bilo moguće, dali su nam taj sami, živi identitet. Nismo više istog reda od prošlosti. Da bismo je pronašli, upućeni smo na pokušaju rekonstrukcije pomoću izvornika, arhiva, spomenika, a takav postupak doprinosi povratku do tadašnje situacije, te to je nešto drugo. Čim se naša, hronika itd., „istorija“ poprimi je novi izgled i to je toliko sveobuhvatno značenje da preti da naprasto potisne reč „istorija“ i praktičnu istoriju podvode pod sluzbu sećanja.
The second reason for this outbreak of memory is of a social nature and is linked to what might be called, by analogy with “acceleration”, the “democratization” of history. This takes the form of a marked emancipatory trend among peoples, ethnic groups and even certain classes of individual in the world today; in short, the emergence, over a very short period of time, of all those forms of memory bound up with minority groups for whom rehabilitating their past is part and parcel of re-affirming their identity.

Minority memories of this kind are mainly the outcome of three types of decolonization: international decolonization, which has allowed societies previously stagnating in the ethnological inertia of colonial oppression access to historical consciousness and the rehabilitation (or fabrication) of memories; domestic decolonization, within traditional western societies, of social, religious and provincial minorities now being integrated with the mainstream and for whom re-affirming their “memory” - in actual fact, their history - is a way of having their “particularism” recognized by a community that had previously refused them that right, while at the same time cultivating their difference and their attachment to an identity threatened with disintegration. (Had I had the time, I would have liked to have shown you this, taking working-class or Jewish memory, for example.) Finally, there is a third type of decolonization which followed on the collapse of twentieth-century totalitarian regimes, whether communist, Nazi or just plain dictatorial: an ideological decolonization which has helped reunite these liberated peoples with traditional, long-term memories confiscated, destroyed or manipulated by those regimes: this is the case with Russia and many countries in Eastern Europe, the Balkans, Latin America and Africa.

The explosion of minority memories of this kind has profoundly altered the respective status and the reciprocal nature of history and memory - or, to be more precise, has enhanced the very notion of “collective memory”, hitherto little used.

Unlike history, which has always been in the hands of the public authorities, of scholars and specialised peer groups, memory has acquired all the new privileges and prestige of a popular protest movement. It has come to resemble the revenge of the underdog or injured party, the outcast, the history of those denied the right to History. Hitherto, if it did not have truth, it at least had loyalty on its side. What is new, and what it owes to the abysmal sufferings of the last century, to the increase in life expectancy and to the continuing presence of survivors, is the demand for a truth more “truthful” than that of history, the truth of personal experience and individual memory.

History, on the other hand, though it was always founded on memory, as a discipline that aspired to scientific status had traditionally been built up in opposition to memory, thought to be idiosyn-
The concept of identity has undergone a similar reversal in meaning at the same time as that of memory. It has gone from being an individual and subjective notion to a collective, quasi-formal and objective one. Traditionally, identity characterises all that is unique about an individual - so much so, in fact, that it has acquired an essentially administrative sense relating to law enforcement: our fingerprints are the expression of our ‘identity’ cards and papers. The expression has become a group category, a way of defining us from without. ‘One is not born a woman’, Simone de Beauvoir famously remarked, ‘one becomes one’. It might serve as a catch-phrase for all identities created from self-assertion. Identity, like memory, is a form of duty. I am asked to become what I am: a Corsican, a Jew, a worker, an Algerian, a Black. It is at this level of obligation that the decisive tie is formed between memory and social identity. Viewed in this light, they are both governed by the same mechanism: the two terms have become all but synonymous, and the fact that they have merged reflects a change in the way that history and society interact.

France, with an intensity both emotional and political, has traditionally maintained an essential, determining connection to its history and its past. That is why France knew such a broad and profound transformation of national historical consciousness in social consciousness. With the installation of the Third Republic this connection assumed a particular centrality, since history had become the nerve of the social and political bond. Through the schools, the scholarly little manuals of Ernest Lavisse, and books for children like the celebrated Tour de la France par deux enfants, the grand narrative of the national collectivity was set. An epic in many different versions, offered to everyone, it smoothed out any particularity, whether provincial, familial, linguistic, religious, social, or sexual, that did not readily fit the grand national history. On the one hand, therefore, was a saga, a powerful recitative with a touch of epic, with its highs and lows, its great moments and its ordeals, its inexcusable repertoire of personalities, scenes, lines, intriques, dates, good and bad people - an absorbing family saga starting with Vercingetorix and the battle of Alésia and ending with the triumph of the Republic and the Rights of Man, touching on the Crusades, Louis XIV, the Enlightenent, the Revolution, the Napoleonic epic, the colonial conquests, the trials of World War I, and ending up with de Gaulle, the heir to all of this. On the other hand were particular affinities and individual loyalties. In sum, there is a collective national history on the one hand, private memories on the other. It was sacred history because it was just like the religious catechism it was supposed to combat; holy because it was that of the patrie which merited the sacrifice of one’s life; and sacred history because it was just like the religious catechism it was called “Israelites” at the time), royalists, Bretons or Corsicans, women. It was on this division that the internal collapse of the myth that bore the supernatural of its heritage; holy because it was that of the patrie which merited the sacrifice of one’s life; and sacred history because it was just like the religious catechism it was called “Israelites” at the time), royalists, Bretons or Corsicans, women. It was on this division that the internal collapse of the myth that bore the
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This double movement burst forth in the crucial decade of the 1970s, when France experienced a key transformation. The emergence of a sovereign, tyrannical, and almost intrusive „national memory” was tied directly to the transition from a historical consciousness of self to a social consciousness; national identity was replaced by social identities. Traditional faith in the greatness and destiny of France was attacked from within; the European, colonial, and world wars – 1914-1918, 1939-1945, and the Algerian War – led not only to a real reduction in power but also to profound, insidious doubt about the validity and inaffability of the classic national model. The result was an upsurge of the repelled episodes of the national consciousness (from the Terror during the Revolution to torture during the Algerian War in the 1950s); a crisis in all the institutions - churches, unions, parties, families - whose mission it was to give a national form; an uncertainty about what to teach in the schools, and inability to achieve a balance between the forces of decentralisation and the move to join the European Union. During that time, a powerful internal decolonisation movement and the emancipation of group identities were taking place in France; each minority seeking integration wanted its own history, its „memory”; each wanted „to reappropriate its own memory” and demanded that the nation recognise that history. The Jewish case serves as a prime example. Hardly anyone would have spoken about a Jewish „memory” thirty years ago. Even the memory of Vichy was not totally linked to anti-Semitic legislation or to the French state’s responsibility for deportation and extermination. The opposite situation exists today. The „Jewish community” – a phrase that would not have been used then – has relentlessly demanded that the president of the Republic recognise France’s responsibility in that regard. Jacques Chirac acceded to that demand on July 16, 1995, at the Vélodrome d’Hiver, the sports stadium to which Jews were herded in 1942 prior to deportation. What in France is now called the „national memory” is nothing other than the transformation of historic memory, which has been invaded, subverted, and flooded by group memories. At this point, of course, it would be important to describe in greater detail how this new memory is organised. I have tried to do this in my introductions and conclusions to Realsms of Memory. Let us make do for the moment, by way of conclusion, with underlying some of the immediate effects of this recent surge in memory. There are two main effects, it seems to me.

The first consists in a dramatic increase in the uses made of the past for political, commercial and tourist purposes. One example of this is a sharp rise in the number of commemorative events, particularly in France. The last decade, 1989 to 2000, may even have marked the high point of this „age of commemoration”, with at one end the Bicentenary of the French Revolution – in which the phenomenon, already well under weigh by this time, took on its full historic, political, national, religious, ideological and symbolic significance – and at the other the new millennium. Between those two dates, each year brought its particular batch of commemorations, from the Dreyfus affair and the 80th anniversary of the armistice of 1918 to the 1,500th anniversary of Clovis and the 150th anniversary of the abolition of slavery. France is, I believe, the only country to have set up a National Festivities Bureau, now in its twentieth year. There are all kinds of reasons for this proliferation of commemorative events, but they all go to show that the past has ceased to have a single meaning and that a present that is overlaid with an awareness of its own history necessarily allows for several possible versions of the past.

The second effect of this change in the way memory is organised has been to deprive the historian of the monopoly he traditionally enjoyed in interpreting the past. In a world in which you had collective history and individual memories, the historian exercised exclusive control, so to speak, over Ova dvostruki pokret razvija se uporedo, a u presudnim 70-im godinama, u kojima je Francuska prošla kroz dalekosežne promene, i to značajno bržim tempom. Tajna koja se krije iza nastanka hegemonijskog, tiranijskog, skoro kompulzivnog „nacionalnog sećanja” leži u prelazu sa istorijske na društvenu svet. Na mesto nacionalnog identiteta stupa socijalni identitet. Tradicionalna vera u veličinu i sudbinu francuske nacije poljuljana je iznutra: Ratovi, bilo da su evropski, svetski ili kolonijalni – dakle rat između 1914. i 1918. onaj između 1939. i 1945. i rat u Alžiru – ne samo da su Francuskoj doneli realan gubitak moći, već i duboku, pritajenu sumnju u legitimitet i nepogrešivost klasičnog nacionalnog modela. Kao posledica toga na površinu je isplivalo sve ono što je nacionalni ponos bio potisnuto, počev o terora za vreme Revolucije pa sve do torturu tokom rata u Alžiru; sve institucije koje su bile u službi obrazovanja nacije – a to znači crkva, sindikati, partijske, porodice – zapale su u krizu; smisao pedagoškog naravučenja doveden je u pitanje, a položaj Francuske između nečeta dekolonizacije i uvođenja u zajednički evropski koncept bilo je veoma teško definisati. Istodobno se razvijao i snažan pokret unutarnje dekolonizacije i emancipacije grupnog identiteta, što je ohrabrilo manjine na putu ka nacionalnoj integraciji: Svača manjina zatražila je pravo na vlastitu istoriju, dakle vlastito „sećanje”, koju je, kao što se govori, „zeleno ponovo da stekne” i zahtevala je od nacije da to sećanje i prizna. Primer Jevrejeve posebno je slikovit. Pre trideset godina teško da bi neko govorio o jevrejskom „sećanju”. Cak ni sećanje na Viješ nije se primarno odnosilo na antisemitske zakone i odgovornost francuske države za deportaciju i ubijanje Jevreje. Danas je sasvim suprotno. „Jevrejska zajednica” – još jedan izraz koji se ranije ne bi koristio – u vezi je navrata zahteva od predsednika republike da prizna taj vid odgovornosti, sve dok Zak Širak to nije učinio 16. jula 1953. godine na zimskoj biciklističkoj stazi, gde su Jevreji okupljeni u velikoj radionici. U Francuskoj se pod „nacionalnim sećanjem” ne podrazumeva ništa drugo do preinačenje, invazija, podrivanje i preplavljanje bazične istorijske svesti od strane sećanja pojedinih grupa. Sada bi naravno bilo od značaja da dalje razradimo posledice ovog novog sećanja. To sam pokušao da učinim u uvodu i pogovoru zbirci Lieux de mémoire. Neka na tom mestu bude dovoljno što ćemo na kraju istaći nekoliko direktnih, dakle neposrednih posledica ovog naglog uspona sećanja.

Naročito mi se dva uticaja čine značajnim. Jedan je da se od tada prošlost sve intenzivnije koristi, bilo politički, u svrhe turizma ili komercijalno. U prilog takvoj tendenciji govori i naglo rastuća krivulja pomenâ, što je u Francuskoj posebno uočljivo. Poslednja decenija XX veka mogla bi se nazvati i vrhuncem ove ere sećanja, omeđena 200. godišnjicom Francuske revolucije, koja je demonstrirala celokupnu istorijsku, političku, nacionalnu, versku, ideološku i simboličku težinu ovog svakako dobro etabliranog fenomena, i proslavom smene milenijuma. Svaka godina doprinela je svoj dvo pomena, počev od afere Dreyfus preko Hlodovehove 1500. godišnjice, od 80. godišnjice primirja iz 1918. pa sve do 150 godina od ukiđanja ropstva. Francuska je, koliko mi je poznato, jedina zemlja koja već dvadeset godina ima komisiju za nacionalne praznike. Brojni su razlozi za ovakav uspon pomena: Svi oni pokazuju da prošlost ne kulminira više u jednom jedinom značenju i da sadašnjost, ukoliko se reflektuje u istorijskoj samosvesti, mora prihvatiti više mogućih verzija prošlosti.

Drugi uticaj nove ekonomije sećanja svodi se na to da se istoričarima oduzima monopol, koji su tradicionalno držali nad tumačenjem prošlosti. U svetu u kojem je postojala jedna jedina kolektivna istorija i mnogo individualnih sećanja oni su imali nekakvu vrstu ekskluzivne kontrole na...
the past. This privilege had even been greatly consolidated over the last hundred years by what is sometimes referred to as „scientific“ history. To the historian alone befell the task of establishing the facts, producing the evidence and delivering the truth. It was his profession and his mark of respectability. Today, the historian is far from alone in manufacturing the past; it is a role he shares with the judge, the witness, the media and the legislator. All the more reason, therefore, to speak out loud and clear today on behalf of the „duty towards history“, rather than the „duty to remember“, the need for which a few of us were proclaiming some twenty or twenty-five years ago.

For the real problem raised by the sacred aura with which memory has now been invested is to know how, why and at what moment the otherwise positive principle of emancipation and liberation on which it is based backfires and becomes a form of closure, a grounds for exclusion and an instrument of war. To claim the right to memory is, at bottom, to call for justice. In the effects it has had, however, it has often become a call to murder. The time has perhaps come to bring against me mory the charge that in his Untimely Meditations Nietzsche brought a century ago against history, but replacing the word „historical“ by „memorial“: „There is a certain degree of sleeplessness, of rumination, of [memorial] significance beyond which any living creature is threatened with collapse, and in the long run destroyed, whether it be an individual, a people or a civilization.“ It is this message left by memory that we also need to remember.

Jer pravi problem koji proističe iz sakralizacije sećanja sastoji se u tome da otkrijemo kako se, zašto i u kom trenutku pozitivan princip emancipacije i oslobođenja, koji je omogućio procvat sećanja, pretvara u svoju suprotnost i u neki vid zatočenija, čak i u oružje. Principijelno je zahtev za vlastitim sećanjem ujedno i poziv na pravdu. Na delatnom planu često se pokazao kao poziv na linč. Možda je došlo vreme da proces koji je Niče pre više od sto godina pokrenuo protiv istorije sada ponovo pokrenemo protiv sećanja i da, kao što je on to učinio u Nesavremenim razmatranjima, ali zamenivši reč „istorija“ rečju „sećanje“, izdamo sledeće upozorenje: „Postoji jedan stepen nesanice, preživanja, [memorijalnog] smisla, na kojem je to živo biva oštećeno i nizad propada, pa bio to čovek ili narod ili kultura.“ Jednako smo dužni da upamteno i ovu poruku sećanja.
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“...a Comprehensive Reevaluation of European History?“

Developments, Tendencies and Problems of a Culture of Remembrance in Europe

In August this year a declaration entitled “Celebrating the Events of 1989 also Means Remembering 1939” was published by a large German national weekly, initiated, *inter alia*, by the current Commissioner for Documents of the Former DDR State Security and her predecessor. It was signed by numerous public figures, including a notable number of historians from the left liberal spectrum. The title brings about the impression that the initiators did this as a for form of warning, in view of the multimedia storm in form of various activities on the 20th anniversary of the fall of Berlin Wall, as well as the 70th anniversary of begin- ning of World War II, which has been raging as early as since 2009. However, already the caption represents a disappointment for all those who perhaps hoped for such a signal.

Namely, this was a declaration on the 70th anniversary of the August 23 1939 Hitler-Stalin Pact. The text contains many balanced, sensible and true sentences about the historical meaning of this pact between the two dictators. However, its direction in terms of policy of remembrance is only introduced in the last sentence, *en passant*. It is stated that in April, the European Parliament recognized for the first time its responsibility to build a responsible culture of remembrance which will sensitize new public figures, including a notable number of historians from the left liberal specter. The title brings about the impression that the initiators did this as a for form of warning, in view of the multimedia storm in form of various activities on the 20th anniversary of the fall of Berlin Wall, as well as the 70th anniversary of begin- ning of World War II, which has been raging as early as since 2009. However, already the caption represents a disappointment for all those who perhaps hoped for such a signal.

Namely, this was a declaration on the 70th anniversary of the August 23 1939 Hitler-Stalin Pact. The text contains many balanced, sensible and true sentences about the historical meaning of this pact between the two dictators. However, its direction in terms of policy of remembrance is only introduced in the last sentence, *en passant*. It is stated that in April, the European Parliament recognized for the first time its responsibility to build a responsible culture of remembrance which will sensitize new public figures, including a notable number of historians from the left liberal specter. The title brings about the impression that the initiators did this as a for form of warning, in view of the multimedia storm in form of various activities on the 20th anniversary of the fall of Berlin Wall, as well as the 70th anniversary of begin- ning of World War II, which has been raging as early as since 2009. However, already the caption represents a disappointment for all those who perhaps hoped for such a signal.

1 The following article was already published by “Blättern für deutsche und internationale Politik”, entitled „Geschichte als Waffe“, no. 5/2010, pp. 109-121. For the purpose of this publication, it was edited and supplemented with bibliographical references. The suggested „Charts“ at the end of the article will be topic of discussion at the annual „JC Memo“ general meeting this October which will take place at the Wevelsburg Memorial Museum.

2 The declaration was printed by different publications. As the list of signatories did not remain the same throughout, we refer to the Federal Foundation for the Reparation of the former GDR’s Dictatorship’s website [www.23August1939.de](http://www.23August1939.de), also compare with my commentary „Schlachtfeld EU. Wie der Jahrestag des Hitler-Stalin-Pakts feiert auch, sich an 1939 zu erinnern!“ erschien im August diesen Jahres eine u. a. von der derzeitigen Bundesbeauftragten für die Unterlagen der ehemaligen Staatssicherheit der DDR und ihrem Vorgänger initiierte Anzeige in einer großen überregionalen deutschen Wochenzeitung, die von zahlreichen Persönlichkeiten, darunter von auffällend vielen Historikern gerade auch aus dem linksliberalen Spektrum, unterschrieben wurde. 2 Nun lässt der Titel zunächst vermuten, dass es den Initiatoren um die Mahnung geht, in dem spätestens seit Anfang 2009 über uns herein gebrochenen multimedialen Dauergewitter der verschiedensten Aktivitäten zum 20. Jubiläum des Mauerfalls den keinesfalls ganz unrichtigen 70. Jahrestag des Beginns des Zweiten Weltkrieges zu vergessen. Doch bereits die Unterzeile enttäuscht diejenigen, die möglicherweise auf ein solches Zeichen gehofft hatten.

Es handelte sich nämlich um einer Erklärung zum 70. Jahrestag des Hitler-Stalin-Paktes am 23. August 1939. Der Text enthält viele ausgewogene, sensible und richtige Sätze über die historische Bedeutung dieses Paktes der beiden Diktatoren. Doch die mit der Erklärung verbundene erinnerungspolitische Zielrichtung wird erst im letzten Satz und nur quasi *en passant* eingeführt. Im April, so heißt es dort, habe sich das Europäische Parlament erstmalig zu seiner Verantwortung bekannt, eine...
generations for new authoritarian and dictatorial developments. This is the road which was to be continued.

Whether we like it or not, we must assume that the declaration's signatories know which course of remembrance they implicitlyly support with their signature. Still, it is clearly noticeable that only few experts dealing with remembrance and commemoration in Europe are familiar with this important, paradigmatic Resolution of the European Parliament.

In April 2009, timely before the new elections, the European Parliament passed a Resolution by an overwhelming majority declaring August 23 Remembrance Day for Victims of Totalitarian and Authoritarian Regimes. The Resolution which was installed primarily by Baltic, Czech and Polish deputies of Christian-democratic, liberal and national fractions and — certainly no coincidence — during Prime Minister Vaclav Klaus’ term as President of the Council of EU. It demands, inter alia, “a comprehensive revaluation of European history.” The Resolution states that “Europe will be united only when it is capable to reach a common point of view on its history, recognize communism, Nazism and fascism as collective legacy and lead an honest and thorough debate on all totalitarian crimes of the last century.” In order to reach this goal, the European Parliament calls for “creation of a platform for the remembrance and conscience of Europe which will offer support for the networking and cooperation of research institutes dealing with the history of totalitarianism, as well as the creation of a pan-European documentation center, i.e. a pan-European memorial site for victims of all totalitarian regimes.”


Hetle-ne htel, moramo da pretpostavimo da potpisnici ovog saopštenja znaju na koji politički kurs u pogledu kulture sećanja su se svojim potpisom implicitno obavezali. Ipak, da se uvek iznoz vazapati da veoma mali broj stručnjaka u Evropi koji se bave sećanjem i komemoracijom zna za onu ipak zadovoljujući i važnu, skoro paradigmaticnu Rezoluciju Evropskog parlamenta.

Blagovremeno pred izbore, Evropski parlament je aprila 2009. sa velikom većinom izglasao da se 23. avgust proglasi danom sećanja na žrtve totalitarnih i autoritarnih režima. Ova Rezolucija koju su pre svega baltski, češki i poljski parlamentarci hrišćansko-demokratske, liberalne i nacionalne provenijencije, i ne tako slučajno, upravo za vreme predsedavanja premijera Vlada Klauza, podneli zahteva da se između ostalog “sveobuhvatno prevednuje evropska prošlost.” „Europa“, kako glasi u toj deklaraciji, „će se tek ujediniti kada bude bila u stanju da dosegne jedan zajednički stav prema prošlosti, i kada prizna komunizam, nacizam i fašizam kao zajedničko povesno zaveženje i kada bude kadra da vodi iskrenu i duboke suštan svrav osnovi zločinima totalitarnih režima prethodnog veka.” Kako bi se ostvario ovaj cilj, Evropski parlament zahteva osnivanje jedinstvene platforme za sećanje i savest Evropi, političko-umijećno a osnovano na duševnim nacionaálnih instituta specijalizovanih za istoču totalitarizma, kao i osnivanje zajedničkog evropskog dokumentacionog centra odnosno zajedničkog evropskog memoriałnog centra za sećanje na sve totalitarnih režima.”

3 Resolution of the European Parliament from April 2 2009 on the Conscience of Europe and Totalitarianism, P6-TA-PROV(2009)0211, also compare with proposal: Europäisches Parlament. Plenarverslag van 30.03.2009. Entschließung des Europäischen Parlaments zum Gewissen Europas und zum Totalitarismus, RC778929DE.doc; according to the undated EP press release, the Resolution was passed with 553 votes in favor, 44 votes against and 33 abstain.\[The vote was preceded by a public hearing on March 18 2009 „Europäische Conscience and Crimes of Totalitarian Communism: 20 Years after“, summoned by Deputy Prime Minister of European Affairs Alexander Vondra and the Permanent Representative of the Czech Republic to the EU Milena Mecenova.\]

4 The establishment of the House of European History is scheduled for 2014 in Brussels. It is described by the previously quoted Claus Leggewie as one of the greatest achievements of (Western) Europe since 1950. (translator’s note).


4 Godine 2014. u Briselu treba da bude otvorena „Kuća (zajedničke) Evropske prošlosti“ koju, na primer, ovde citirani Klaus Legevi (Claus Leggewie) ocenjuje kao jedno od najvažnijih dostignuća (zajedničke) Evropske od
This relatively elaborate, comprehensively reasoned Resolution, imbued with numerous historical and political principles and challenging declarations of intent, moral verdicts and judgments, represents both the conclusion and climax of an opinion-forming process which began in January 1993 in the European Parliament. Namely, almost 16 years before – in February 1993 – the European Parliament had adopted a Resolution on European and international protection of former concentration camps established by the National Socialists, as sites of historical warning. In this Resolution, which was barely half a page long and limited to a few points, the parliamentarians expressed their concern about the future of national memorial sites in the former German Democratic Republic, demanding that maintenance of these authentic sites be placed under European and international protection. At the same time, almost unanimously, following an initiative by presidents of international inmates’ associations, they firmly refused “any form of arbitrary combination of the reality of National Socialist camps and their purpose after the war” – this refers primarily to the Soviet Camps in Sachsenhausen and Buchenwald.

The Change of the Culture of Remembrance

Comparison between the two Resolutions illustrates the deep and enormous change of Europe’s culture of remembrance in recent years. In only 16 years, all principles and basic standpoints regarding the policy of remembrance have almost turned into their opposite when it comes to the most important issues. It is my opinion that this process can be determined based on two directions of development: on the one hand it seems as though the “long process of reaching a certain equality in the European culture of remembrance” between the memories of both totalitarian dictatorships is completed, as opposed to the fears by former culture of remembrance” between the memories of both totalitarian directions of development: on the one hand it seems as though their opposite when it comes to the most important issues. It is regarding the policy of remembrance have almost turned into and enormous change of Europe’s culture of remembrance in recent years.

Der Wandel der Erinnerungskultur


Promena u kulturi sećanja

Poređenje ove dve rezolucije, odnosno odluke, predočava tu duboku i ogromnu promenu koju je kultura sećanja u Evropi doživela poslednjih godina. Za samo šesnaest godina svi principi i osnovni postulati u pogledu kulture sećanja su se skoro preokrenuli u svoju suprotnost. Ova metamorfoza dā se, prema mom mišljenju, utvrditi na osnovu dve manifestacije. S jedne strane čini se da je okončan „dug put do doznanja izvesne jednakosti“ u povesnom sećanju na dve totalitarne diktature, sasvim suprotno od sumnje nekadašnje letonske ministarske inostranih poslova Sandre Kalniête kako ju je ona izrazila oktobra 2007. Ne tako

1950. naovamo. (prim. prev.)

5 Odluka o evropskoj i međunarodnoj zaštiti mesta koja su za vreme nacionalnacionalizma postala koncentracijama logora od 11.02.1933., ćutenci lista Evropske zajednice od 15.03.1993., br. C 72/118E (Amtsblatt der Europäischen Gemeinschaft v. 15.03.1993, Nr. C 72/118E.)

than 40 years of communist oppression into the pan-European culture of remembrance, rightfully demanded mainly by new EU member states of Eastern and Central Europe, is principally no longer brought into question.

The second, certainly no less important change of recent years, is an increasing will in many European countries, as well as in the European Parliament, to unite the different cultures of remembrance through a new form of politics of history, based on a common European master narrative, thus instrumentalizing the past for current political goals much more than it had previously been the case. What are the reasons for such – in historical terms – rapid process of change, and what are its consequences?

A New “Age of Remembrance”

As early as in the early 1990s, French cultural historian Pierre Nora spoke of a new “age of remembrance”. This notable “conjunction of remembrance” (Christoph Cornelißen) is described by some historians as a form of “memory boom”. However, it is not confined only to the territory of Europe. Active debates, primarily on the consequences of a war and dictatorships, are taking place in the USA, many South American states, Korea, Japan, Cambodia and other Asian countries, as well as in various countries in Africa. That is why Fabrice Larat speaks of a “world market of policy of remembrance”, Andrew H. Beattie calls it “cosmopolitan memory”, Henry Rousso analyzes a “global world market of policy of remembrance”, and many others see aarten hearbachen is a Art “memory boom” bezeichnet. Dieser findet jedoch nicht nur auf dem Boden Europas statt. In den USA ebenso wie in vielen südamerikanischen Staaten aber auch in Korea, Japan, Kambodscha und anderen asiatischen Ländern, schließlich auch in verschiedenen Ländern Afrikas, überall find- en engagierte Debatten vor allem über die Folgen von Krieg und Gewaltsphilie statt. Fabrice Larat spricht deshalb von einem „Weltmarkt der Erinnerungspolitik“, Andrew H. Beattie nennt es ein „cosmopolitan memory“, Henry Rousso analysiert ein „globales Historizitätsregime“, wohingegen andere Autoren in einfacher Adaption der wirtschaftlichen Entwicklung in den letzten Jahren einfach von einer globalisierten Erinnerungspolitik sprechen. Wie schon die Nennung der Namen einiger Autoren andeuten sollte, hat sich daraus in wenigen Jahren ein eigener Zweig der Geschichts- und Kulturwissenschaften entwickelt, der inzwischen eine große Fülle von kaum noch zu überschaubarem Material auf diesem neuen Weltmarkt publiziert. Überall dort, wo Diskussionen über das Erbe von Diktaturen und staatlicher Gewalt geschichtliche Relevanz erheischen, überall dort ent-

Ein neues „Zeitalter des Gedenkens“


neosnovan zahtev, pre svega od strane novih istočnoevropskih članica EU, za integracijom svakog pojedinačnog sećanja na četdesetogodišnji period komunističke represije u opšti europski diskurs sećanja, više se načelno ne može dovesti u pitanje.

Drugih, nikako manje bitna, promena poslednjih godina sastoji se u tome da je u mnogim zemljama Evrope, i upravo u Evropskom parlamentu, ojačala volja da se pojedinačne divergentne kulture sećanja objedinile u vidu novog oblika političke sećanja koja bi se zasnivala na zajedničkom europskom mesternarativu čime bi se prošlost još jače i mnogo promišljenije nego do sada instrumentalizovala u političke svrhe. Koji su razlozi za ovaj, gledano u istorijskim razmerama ipak vrlo nagao, preobražaj i koje su nje- gove posledice?
The revival of national myths, illusions and fears is by no means limited to the new EU members, as shown, for instance, by a conflict – luckily carried out only with the use of weapons of history – between the “old” and the “new” Europe concerning the issue of the Iraq War, or when suddenly the memories of the First World War, as described, have been awakened and preserved to such an extent that they have become a Zeitgeschichte, 1-2/2008, December 31 2007, pp.3-6, specifically p. 6.

So, it seems obvious that with the end of the Cold War, the collapse of the old ideological fronts, as well as the development of global communications and economy, a memory boom has been introduced, equally encompassing societies and states. As a consequence, concealed and hushed-up crimes are revealed and forgotten and discredited victims are publicly honored, people receive information on their family members’ graves, the survivors get belated recognition and culprits are brought to justice even decades after their crimes. In many countries, the “memory boom” led to a fundamental change of the culture of remembrance – this mainly benefitted memorial sites, which received previously unknown attention and recognition. However, the end of the taboos and silence marked the beginning of a bitter battle of interpretations: old enemies are reintroduced, rifts between social groups, ethnicities and states are reopened, victims’ rivalries are developing, parties and governments are transforming the reintroduced resentments into “policies of remembrance, i.e. policies of the past”. History becomes a weapon and in extreme cases like, for example, the disintegration of Yugoslavia or the Soviet Union, actual shots are fired. Writer, Nobel Prize laureate and survivor Imre Kertész writes about “Europe’s oppressing heritage” with dismay: “Who would have believed that the ‘velvet revolution’ would prove to be the Eastern European peoples’ time machine, taking them back rather than forward, and that they would continue their child’s play where they left off – in 1919, at the end of World War I.”


Chini si stoga očiglednim da je sa krajem Hladnog rata, sa krajem starih ideoloških oprećnosti i sa razvojem globalnih komunikacije i privrede otočeno i je jedan polet sećanja koji je u podjednakoj meri obuhvatio i društva i države. Otkrivaju se prečuvlichavan i zataškani zločini, zaboravljenim i diskreditovanim žrtvama javno se odaje počast, porodice dobijaju informacije o grobovima svojih mrtvih, a preživeli doživljavaju zasakelo priznanje dok se počinio decenijama denotiraju o njihovih zločinima sudi. U mnogim zemljama je ovaj „memory boom“ doveo do potpunog preokreta u vladajućoj kulturi sećanja i on je pre svega doprinio memorijalnim centrima koji su doživeli do tada nevidenju pažnju i prihvatavanje. Ali s prestankom taba i čučanja usledila je i ogočena borba oko [pravog] tumačenja. Stari neprijatelji ponovo bivaju izvučeni iz naftalina, razjačljaju se jazovi između društvenih grupa, etnosa i država, dolazi do konkurencije između država i grupa, stranke i države u svojim „politikama sećanja i prošlosti“ formulisu resanične formule, koje se ponovo javljaju. Istorija postaje oružje, a u ekstremnim slučajevima, kao na primeru raspada Jugoslavije i Sovjetskog saveza, se u to ime zaista i puca. Pon učau nad „Evropskim teškoznim nasledem“ pisac, nobelovac i preživeli nekoliko koncentracijskih logora Imre Kertesz piše: „ko bi verovao da će se „somotna revolucija“ za narode Istočne Evrope preobraziti u vremensku mašinu koja ih neće odvesti u budućnost, već vratiti nazad kako bi nastavili sa svojim dečijim igrama tamo gde su negde oko 1919., krajem Prvog svetskog rata, bili stali.“

Ponovno oživljavanje nacionalnih mitova, iluzija i straha nije u kom slučaju nije ograničeno samo na nove članice Evropske unije, kao što to, na opštu radost, pokazuje rat u Iraku koji se vodi isključivo oružjem istorije kao konflikt između „stare“ i „nov‘‘ Evrope, kao kada su na primer  između Velike Britanije i Francuske
nental System, Napoleonic Wars and the Vienna Congress are invoked between Great Britain and France, in order to place different opinions on current conflicts in a supposed continuity of national rivalries thus discrediting them. Seventy years after the victory of Falangists led by Franco, Spanish society is particularly torn by dealing with both sides’ crimes during the civil war. The Belgian debate about the establishment of the Mechelen Jewish Museum of Deportation and Resistance is another example of a social division process caused by the issue of remembrance. The question of whether “Transit Mechelen” should be a “classic” Holocaust museum or a place which will deal with the entire history of persecution and genocide in the last centuries was not only faced with the usual victims’ rivalries, but also brought about profound debates on national historical myths and identities. All these completely different conflicts over policy of remembrance share a common feature in the search for an indisputable, uniform, transnational and morally impregnable framework for the interpretation of wars and crimes – primarily those which took place in the 20th century.

Battlefield Europe?

In view of such increasing disputes regarding the policy of remembrance in Europe, it is easy to attempt to force the constitution of a uniform European policy of remembrance by decree and from above. In what he calls “Battlefield Europe”, German political scientist Claus Leggewie recently identified a total of seven circles of “transnational memories” competing in the creation of a collective European remembrance, i.e. tend to become a part thereof. Two of the most important and influential master narratives are undoubtedly the so-called “Holocaust education”, on one side, and the theory of totalitarianism, on the other.

The Stockholm Declaration and the creation of the Task Force for International Cooperation on Holocaust Education, Re-

Toonschicht Europa?

Angezichts solcher zunehmender erinnerungs- politischer Aus- einandersetzung in Europa liegt der Versuch nahe, die Kon- stitution einer einheitlichen europäischen Erinnerungskultur per Dekret und von oben zu erzwingen. Der deutsche Politik- wissenschaftler Claus Leggewie hat kürzlich auf dem, wie er es nennt, „Schlachtfeld Europa“, insgesamt sieben Kreise „trans- nationaler Erinnerungen“ identifiziert, die miteinander um die Bildung eines kollektiven europäischen Gedächtniswett- tefens, bzw. in sie einfließen müssen. Die beiden bedeutendsten und einfussreichsten Meistererzählungen sind dabei zweifellos die so genannte „Holocaust Education“ einerseits und die Totalitaris- mus-theorie andererseits.

Der Stockholmer Erklärung und der darauf fußenden Gründ- ung einer Task Force for International Cooperation on Holocaust opet vaskrslia sećanja na Kontinentalnu blokadu, Napoleonove ratove i Bečki kongres, kako bi se aktuelni konflikti stvari u konti- nuiitet nacionalnih rivalstava i time omalovazili tretinji sukobi mišljenja.Trenutno se, sedamdeset godina nakon pobede Falan- gista na čelu sa Frankom, špansko društvo razdirje zbog suvraćanja sa uzajamnim zločinima. Kao još jedan primer naveliku još jedno društveno razdiranje koje je uzrokovala diskusija u Belgiji po- vonstavljanja muzeja u Meheleu koji se posvećen progono Jevreja. Na pitanju da li “Transit Mehele” treba da postane “klasičan” muzej Holokaustra ili mesto koje će se baviti čitavom is- torijom progona i genocida u proteklim vekovima, sučeliti su se ne samo uobičajene konkurentne grupe žrtava već su se povde- bje rasprave o nacionalnim istorijskim mitovima i identitetima. Svim ovim savim različitim memorijalno-političkim konfliktnima zajednička je potraga za jednoznačnim, jedinstvenim, transnacio- nalnim i moralno neosporivim okvirima za tumačenje ratova i zločina koji su se pre svega odigrali tokom dvadesetog veka.

Bojno polje Evropa?

Suočeni sa ovim sve žustrijim raspravama o kulturi sećanja u Evropi lako možemo da napravimo pogrešan korak pokušavši od- lukom odzviti na naše konstituisanje jedinstvene evropske kulture sećanja. Nemacki politolog Klaus Legevi je nedavno na tom „Bojnom polju Evropou“ identifikovao eksperimentalno sedam kru- govica „transnacionalnog sećanja“ koji su međusobno konkurentni u pogledu stvaranja kolektivnog evropskog sećanja. Ta sećanja sva treba da se utope u evropsko jedinstvo. Dva najvažnija i naj- tajnija maršera akcija su pri tom nesumnjivo tzw. „Holocaust Education“ s jedne strane i Teorija totalitarizma s druge.

Stokholmska deklaracija i na njoj zasnovana organizacija Task Force for International Cooperation on Holocaust Education, Re-

9 Claus Leggewie, Schlachtfeld Europa. Transnationale Erinnerung und europäische Identität, in; Blätter für deutsche und internationale Politik, 2/2009, str. 81-94.
9 Klaus Leggewie, Schlachtfeld Europa. Transnationale Erinnerung und europäische Identität, in; Blätter für deutsche und internationale Politik, 2/2009, str. 81-94.

Günther Moro
Kultura sećanja u Evropi „Blätter für deutsche und internationale Politik“, 5/2010
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However, something conceived as a negative constitutive consensus in Europe, developed into what was described by Tony Judt as Eastern and Central European countries’ entrance ticket into the European Union. This is where the most resistance came from. One’s own experience with the terror of the communist system was perceived as much more oppressive. Other states of Western and Northern Europe which were located in the periphery of the genocidal process also could not equate their own respective memories with the concept of “Holocaust education”. Historians and other experts eventually criticized the decontextualization of genocide, its causal reduction to antisemitism, the fading-out of other victim groups and the tendency to anthropologize the crime, which is connected to the universalization of Auschwitz.

The revival of the theory of totalitarianism which was decisively developed during the Cold War was eventually connected with the attempt to integrate the historical experiences of new member states into the European remembrance. Who would question the fact that millions of victims of the communist terror have equal right to remembrance and commemoration as Nazi victims? However, as opposed to the Holocaust education, the theory of totalitarianism seeks the right to synthesize remembrance of concentration camps and gulags. However, this is not a matter of a scientifically legitimate, even indispensable comparison between genocide and crime, but—despite all denials in Sunday speeches—an a priori equation. While it is officially claimed that there is no Education, Remembrance and Research in the Year of the Holocaust, the Wehnschweis was once again denied in an Anwesenheit of 47 Regierungschefs and other important Staatsvertretern, under them the American President, a politically kaum zu übertreffender Nachdruck verliehen. „Auf der Basis des Schlimmsten“[Henry Rouso] sollte die Neugründung Europas versucht werden. Ausgehend von der Singularitätsthese wurde der Völkermord an den europäischen Juden als das absolut Böse zum negativen Fixpunkt einer einheitlichen europäischen und globalen Erinnerungskultur deklariert. In einer Vielzahl von Konferenzen definierten Heer- scharen von Experten und Diplomaten pädagogisch-didaktische Standards, entwickelten praktische Handlungsanleitungen für die Bekämpfung von Antisemitismus und Rassismus und verpfändeten mittels Patenschaften teilweise privat finanzierte Holo- caust-Museen in verschiedene Länder. In der breiten europäischen Öffentlichkeit hat vor allem die Einführung des 27. Januar als „Holocaust-Gedenktag“ eine größere Wirksamkeit entfaltet.


Mit der Wiederbelebung der in Zeiten des Kalten Krieges maßgeblich entwickelter Totalitarismustheorie schließlich war mehr als nur der Versuch verbunden, die historischen Erfahrungen der neuen Mitgliedsländer in das europäische Gedächtnis zu integrieren. Dass die Millionen Opfer des kommunistischen Terrors in gleichem Maße ein Anrecht auf Gedenken und Erinnerung haben sollen wie die NS-Opfer, wer wollte daran zweifeln. Anders aber als die Holocaust-Education erhebt die Totalitaris- mastheorie den Anspruch, KZ-Gedächtnis und Gulag-Gedächtnis zu synthetisieren. Dabei geht es nicht um den wissenschaftlich legitimieren, gar unverzichtbaren Vergleich von Völkermord und Verbrechen, sondern es geht trotz aller Dementis in den Sonntag-

---

10 Radna grupa za međunarodnu saradnju u oblasti obrazovanja, sećanja i istraživanja Holokausta, ukrašeno ITF (prim. prev.)
intention of turning victims’ suffering against each other in order to prevent classification of first- and second-rate victims, at the same time historical analogies are sought which should affirm the essential indistinguishability of these crimes. Because, from the victims’ perspective – as claimed in the aforementioned European Parliament Resolution on European Conscience and Totalitarianism – it is irrelevant which regime and for what reason robbed them of their freedom, tortured and murdered them.

Strategic Decontextualization

When, for instance, the destruction of Warsaw in 1944 and the murder of hundreds of thousands are stated as the worst example of a “cooperative destruction”10 by the Soviet Union and Nazi Germany, or when the execution of Polish officers in Katyn by the Soviet secret service and the mass murders of Polish elites by the SS and Wehrmacht are evaluated as result of a joint, or at least concordant plan, then the analysis of historical contexts and causes is put in the background of moral verdicts. It is not a matter of explanation and justification of historical events and processes, but only of remembrance and condemnation. As shown by the following quote of renowned British historian Norman Davies, this level of decontextualization can bring about a reevaluation of crime through comparison between Stalinism and National Socialism. “In light of the consequential change of course”, – Norman Davies writes in his book “A Heart of Europe: A Short History of Poland”11 – “one could even conclude that the Soviet terror in this period (1939–41, G. M.) largely surpassed the one by the Nazis. In regard to techniques and logistics of terror, the Stalinist system had a head start over the Nazis, since it had built the necessary apparatus during recent cleansings in its own country. While the Germans still prepared Auschwitz or Treblinka, the Soviets could easily endure the increase of their ‘Gulag Arhipelago’s population by a couple of million Poles and Western Ukrainians. Namely, they preferred condemning their victims to a gradual, slow death from cold and hunger, whereas the Germans opted for quick killing – and who is to say which was more humane – however, the result was practically the same.” The widely

Strategische Entkontextualisierung


Strategijska dekontekstualizacija

Kada se npr. pustošenje Varače 1944. i ubijanje stotine hiljada ljudi navode kao najstrašniji primjer „kooperativnog uništenja”10 udruženih Sovjetskog saveza i nacističke Nemačke, ili kada se streljanje poljskih oficira u Katinu od strane sovjetske tajne službe i masovna ubistva poljske elite koje su sporedeeljne kategorije, i Vermaht označavaju kao rezultat zajedničkih ili bar podudarnih planova, onda analiza istorijskih konteksta i uzroka biva stavljen izvan moralnih načela. Nije više reč o objašnjenju i utemeljenju istorijskih događaja i procesa, već samo o sećanju i osudi. Dekontekstualizacija koja je u toj meri sprovedena može, kako pokazuje citat poznatog britanskog istoričara Normana Dejvisa, u poređenju staljinizma sa nacionalsozializmom da uslovi preveljanje zločina. „U novom svetu promene konglera moglo bi se čak zaključiti“, piše Norman Dejvis u svojoj knjizi „U srcu Evrope. Istorija Poljske“11, „da je sovjetski teror u toj fazi (misli se na period 1939–41, prim. aut.) umnoženo nadmašio teror nacista. Staljinistički sistem je, u pogledu tehnike i logistike terora, bio u prednosti u odnosu na nacista, jer je toko čistki koji su prethodile ratu u sopstvenoj zemlji uspeo da izgradi potreban aparat. Dok su Nemezi još pripremali Auschvic i Treblinku, Sovjeti su mogli da bez velikih poteškoća pretrpe porast broja stanovnika svog „Arhipela gulaga“ za nekoliko milijuna Poljaka i zapadnih Ukrajina. Oni su svoje žrtve radije prepuštali laganu smrti usled hladnoće i gladi, dok su nacisti davali prednost brzom umršćenju – i ko bi tu uopšte mogao reći šta je bilo humanije – ali rezultat je bio praktično isti.“ Na stranu to što ovaj i dalje priznati britanski istoričar sećenje time celju predistoriju koncentracijnih logora, počev

renowned British historian not only skips the entire prehistory of the concentration camp system, from Dachau and Sachsenhausen to Buchenwald, Flossenbürg and Mauthausen – he also withheld that the most Holocaust victims were, in true sense of the word, slaughtered by Einsatzgruppen. Finally, he even approaches the controversial self estimate of mass murderers who gave themselves credit of having invented a more “humane” form of mass destruction – gas chambers.

**Forced Unification**

With this background – to state an example from the Sachsenhausen memorial center – it is utterly insignificant whether the terrible mass dying of the inmates of Soviet special camps from hunger and illness as result of criminal conditions of imprisonment in the period from 1945 to 1950 will be interpreted primarily as result of a prepared murder plan or a consequence of the typical Stalinist indifference towards human life in the backdrop of a hunger epidemic which ravaged large parts of Central and Eastern Europe. Whoever even states such differences and qualifies them as distinguishing feature, becomes suspicious not only to organizations representing victims and their interests, but to certain public and political circles, as well.

Naturally, the forced unification is particularly strong at places of multiple pasts. For instance, Sachsenhausen which was originally a Nazi camp and center of the entire concentration camp system between 1936 and 1945, as well as a training and educational center near Berlin and later the largest Soviet special camp, can exemplarily show that in the long term there is no way of overlapping and common remembrance of both dictatorship’s victims without opening graves and wounds, particularly when it is state-financed. In such conditions, it is difficult even for science to free itself of instrumentalization and assimilation. The multicausal history of the special camp’s origin is not only a result of World War II – caused by Germany – but also of the continuity of Soviet secret service’s terror, as well as the extraordinarily heterogeneous composition of the inmate population and therefore

**Der Zwang zur Vereinheitlichung**

Auf diesem Hintergrund ist es, um ein Beispiel aus der Gedenkstätte Sachsenhausen zu nennen, auch völlig unwichtig, ob das furchtbare Massensterben, das die Inhaftierten der sowjetischen Speziallager durch Hunger und Krankheiten aufgrund der verbrecherisch zu nennenden Haftbedingungen in den Jahren 1945–50 dahin raffte, in erster Linie das Ergebnis eines vor gewaschenen Mordplans oder die Folge typisch stalinistischer Gleichgültigkeit gegenüber Menschenleben vor dem Hintergrund einer große Teile Mittel- und Osteuropas verwüstenden Hungerepidemie interpretiert wird. Wer solche Unterschiede überhaupt benennt und sie gar als Unterscheidungsmerkmal qualifiziert, macht sich nicht nur gegenüber Opfer- und Interessenorganisationen, sondern auch in bestimmten Teilen der Öffentlichkeit und Politik bereits verdächtig.

it defies politically and morally desired simple models of explanation. The perception of the true complexity of historical events is shattered due to the obviously overpowering necessity for clear and indisputable systems for determining guilt as well as condemnation and evaluation – on one hand, in the context of the special camps as places of internment of Nazi criminals and as German branch of the Soviet gulag system. This can only result in suspicions and insinuations, mutual accusations and insults. The more the process of unification of memory and remembrance is forced for political reasons, the stronger the conflicts become. Only based on an unforced coexistence of different historical narratives is it perhaps possible (this is the experience of Sachsenhausen) to gradually and slowly build understanding on similarities and differences of different criminal complexes.

**Example August 23, 1939**

The problematic consequences of constituting a unified European culture of remembrance by decree can be illustrated with the introduction of August 23 as Remembrance Day for the Victims of All Totalitarian and Authoritarian Dictatorships.

By choosing the date when the so-called Hitler-Stalin Pact was signed, there is a danger of wresting the beginning of World War II from its historical causalities and dissolve it in a new historical construct. The impression is created that the war and the genocide from its historical causalities and dissolve it in a new historical construct. The impression is created that the war and the genocide from its historical causalities and dissolve it in a new historical construct. The perception of the true complexity of historical events is shattered due to the obviously overpowering necessity for clear and undisputable systems for determining guilt as well as condemnation and evaluation – on one hand, in the context of the special camps as places of internment of Nazi criminals and as German branch of the Soviet gulag system. This can only result in suspicions and insinuations, mutual accusations and insults.

The problematics of the construction of a singular European culture of remembrance based on an unforced coexistence of different historical narratives is it perhaps possible (this is the experience of Sachsenhausen) to gradually and slowly build understanding on similarities and differences of different criminal complexes.

**Exemple 23. August 1939.**

Die problematischen Folgen der Konstituierung einer einheitlichen europäischen Erinnerungskultur per Dekret lassen sich sehr gut an der Einführung des 23. August als Gedenktag für die Opfer totalitärer und autoritärer Diktaturen zeigen.


**Primer 23. Avgust 1939.**

Problematične posledice stvaranja jedinstvene evropske kulture sećanja na osnovu naredbe odozgo daju se veoma lako ilustrovati na primeru uvođenja 23. avgusta kao dana sećanja na žrtve totalitarnih i autoritarnih diktatura.

Time što je datum potpisivanja tzv. sporazuma Molotov-Ribbentrop izabran za taj dan, javlja se opasnost da se početak Drugog svetskog rata istog st instrumente svoje političke ideologije i da se on rastoji u vidu novom istorijskom kontekstu. Stvara se utisak da su genocid i rat počev od 1. septembra 1939 posledica konflikta dve totalitarne diktature za jedne strane i demokratskih liberalnih država na drugoj. Ništa ne može biti pogrešnije od toga, jer je plan nacionalistaca da napadnu Poljsku postoji još od 1933. godine, što je proizlazilo iz različite ideologije Lebenbrauma, dok je Sovietisk savez i te kako ozbiljno, bar do Minheinskog sporazuma, razmatrao da sklopi savez ne samo sa zapadnim silama, već i sa Poljskom. I uz sve to, tadašnja Poljska je i sama bila autoritarna, čak delimično nacionalistička, i autoritarna, država koja se i sama malo pre toga u savezu sa nacionalistima i demokratskim liberalnim vlastima, često i sa Poljskom. To je samo bezbrižno izgledalo jedne demokratske i liberalne istočnoevropske države, često i sa Poljskom. – što znači da je i sama bila sve samo ne protivnik totalitarnih diktaturama.
tic policy. This means that Poland was anything but the opposite of a totalitarian dictatorship.

To avoid being misunderstood I wish to add that, on the other hand, we must, of course, face the subjective experience of suffering with acceptance and understanding, as recently strikingly displayed by Andrzej Wajda in his award-winning film “The Katyn Massacre”. Both occupiers attacked Poland with similar terror – especially against the Polish elites – and committed countless Massacre”. Both occupiers attacked Poland with similar terror

The following terms are used: “battlefields”, “historic events”, “political narratives”, “memorial sites”, “Erinnerungskultur”, “nationalisms”.

That way, the attempt to create an anti-totalitarian culture of remembrance in Europe through the Resolution of the European Parliament may result with a questionable decontextualization with no foreseeable consequences, at the price of erasing clear historical causality and indisputable responsibilities.

It is becoming obvious how seriously the authors of the Resolution on the Conscience of Europe truly observe the “comprehensive reevaluation of European history” which is explicitly stated in their explanatory text. It is not their goal only to honor communist terror victims – the date of the October Revolution would have been perhaps better suited for that purpose – but also to elevate a political theory to the level of a master narrative which would be binding on the whole of Europe and suppress the rivaling models of explanation.

Battlefields in the “War of Remembrance”

Many authors and scientists describe the process of constituting a new collective European culture of remembrance with the use of drastic terms. The following terms are used: “battlefields”,


Begrüßung des einzig demokratischen und liberalen osteuropäischen Staates, nämlich der anders als Polen den deutschen Exilanten und Widerstandskämpfern Heimstatt und Schutz gewährenden Tschechoslowakei, im Geleitzug der nationalsozialistischen Eroberungspolitik beteiligt hatte, alles andere als das Gegenbild einer totalitären Diktatur also.


So nimmt der Versuch, eine antitotalitäre Erinnungskultur in Europa durch Beschluss des Europäischen Parlaments zu stiften, eine in ihren Folgen noch nicht abschließbare, bedenkliche Entkontextualisierung zum Preis der Verwischung klarer historischer Kausalitäten und eindeutiger Verantwortlichkeiten in Kauf.


Kako me ne biste pogrešno shvatili, dodao bih da s druge strane moramo da prihvatimo i razumemo subjektivna iskustva patnje, kako je to na vrlo upečetljiv način pokazao Adnrej Vajda u svom nedavno nagrađenom filmu „Masakar u Katini“. Oba okupatora su se istovetnom silom obrušili na Poljsku, pre svega na njene elite, počivniti nebrojene zločine. S pravom Alaida Asman upozorava da potonji uvidi u istorijske kontekte ne smeju da učutaju istinu punktnalnih iskustava. Ona se u svakom slučaju moraju kontekstualizovati. Memorijalni centri ne smeju da obustave svoj rad sa prikazivanjem i tumačenjem, sem ako ne žele da prednost daju nemislijivom solipsizmu.

Tako pokušaj da se u Evropi kroz odluku Evropskog parlamenta pokrene antitotalitarna kultura sećanja može imati kao posledicu diskutabilnu dekontekstualizaciju zločina, čije posledice još ne možemo sagledati, a sve to po cenu brisanja jasnih istorijskih uzročnosti i jednoznačnih odgovornosti.


Bojna polja u „ratu sećanja“

Mnogi autori i naučnici grubim rečima opisuju proces konstituisanja nove kolektivne evropske kulture sećanja. Govori se
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Gunther Morsch Erinnerungskultur in Europa „Blätter für deutsche und internationale Politik“, Heft 5/2010
“battles of interpretation”, “weapons”, “mobilization”, “enemies”, “dividing lines”, “trenches” or even explicitly, as by Harald Welzer, the “war of remembrance”\textsuperscript{11}. Other military terms are being used, too, in order to characterize the conflicts over the European policy of remembrance. As head of a memorial site foundation which has been exposed to the conflicts and competing remembrances for years, I can fully understand the choice of vocabulary. That is why, as representatives of memorial sites and historical museums, we must be fully aware of the fact that our sites are seen by some governments, parties and interest groups as significant part of the arsenal in the battle of interpretation over European remembrance. Wherever the interpretation of the past becomes an instrument of political influence, museums and memorial sites are quickly created, upgraded or reconceptualized, in order to freeze the respective Interpretation of history in stone, concrete or glass.


Notably, the majority of those newly founded historical museums, e. the Budapest "House of Terror", founded in 2001 by the conservative-liberal Fidesz government, or the Warsaw Uprising Museum created by the city’s then Mayor Kaczynski, use mainly scenographical means which reflects their obvious desire to generate simple answers, rather than ask questions. They are experience-museums, where a visitor can stand behind a machine gun and slip into the role of a hero fighting against evil. Unlike former Memorial sites, these museums are making a great effort to overwhelm the audience and it is for that reason that they barely allow any alternative historical perspectives. They do not support the formation of independent judgment, but also spare neither creative nor financial efforts to convey preconceived and undisputable doctrines to the visitors. That is one of the reasons of their obviously extraordinary popularity.

From the perspective of memorial sites’ educational purpose, it is necessary to challenge the process of decontextualization and dedifferentiation favoring historical or even anthropological theorems which should encompass different criminal complexes.

\textsuperscript{13} Harald Welzer (publisher), Der Krieg der Erinnerer Holocaust, Kollaboration und Widerstand im europäischen Gedächtnis, Frankfurt/ Main, 2007.

\textsuperscript{12} Harald Welzer (Hrsg), Der Krieg der Erinnerer Holocaust, Kollaboration und Widerstand im europäischen Gedächtnis, Frankfurt/Main 2007.

\textsuperscript{14} Harald Welzer (izdavač), Der Krieg der Erinnerer Holocaust, Kollaboration und Widerstand im europäischen Gedächtnis, Frankfurt/ Main 2007.
Is it really possible that all evils in the world stem from the systematic difference between totalitarian and open societies? Does this mean that, accordingly, victims of (non-totalitarian) military dictatorships and World War I are second- and third-rate victims, respectively? What category do the victims of the Srebrenica or Darfur mass murders belong to? Is it worthwhile to memorialize the 15,000 victims of the Sètif massacre which was committed by French troops against the Algerian population on May 8 1945?

Finally, one should ask to what extent these master narratives – Holocaust education or the theory of totalitarianism – can have a transnationally hermeneutical role? What is the share of German history in the expansive policy of National Socialism no later than since the undigested trauma of World War I and how much can be explained by the Nazi system’s totalitarian structure? What is the responsibility of the Soviet Union in the subjugation of Eastern and Central Europe after World War II through Russian power politics and how much of the Stalinist system was behind it? I believe that the strength of the theory of totalitarianism lies in the explanation of intra-societal processes of dictatorships. However, both theories seem to me as lacking explanation of European states’ mutual relations in the 20th century.

Bone of Contention: Centre Against Expulsions14

The vehement debate taking place in Germany, Poland and the Czech Republic on the planned Centre Against Expulsions represents an attempt of a recontextualization through Europeanization. However, it introduces problems which are by no means less volatile. The demand by liberal and critical circles for embedding the issue in a European context in hope of soothing the emotionally charged conflict between all sides in the “nation building” process. In view of that, the mass and brutal expulsion of Germans after World War II seems less the main consequence of the previous Nazi crimes. Accord-


Zankapfel Zentrum gegen Vertreibungen


Napoleontikum zu postulieren ist in der Hoffnung, so die außerordentlich emotio- nal und brutalen Verfolgungen auf die Karte, die nicht totalitäre Strafprozesse, die von den Nazis verübt wurden, und dem Ausmaß der rassistischen Hetze, die ihnen von den Nazis verübt wurde.

Zusammenfassend kann festgehalten werden, dass die „nation building“ eine verfrühte Entwicklung, die aufgrund der deutschen Vergangenheit und der Verfolgung der Deutschen in Europa, insbesondere in den Niederlanden und Belgien, entsteht. Der Versuch, diese Entwicklung durch Europäisierung zu entkräften, scheitert am Widerstand der Deutschen, die ihre Vergangenheit nicht akzeptieren können. Es ist daher notwendig, eine andere Herangehensweise zu finden, die auf eine gezielte Europäisierung und die Anerkennung der deutschen Vergangenheit basiert.

14 http://www.z-g-v.de/index_noflash.html (translator’s note)
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Jabuka razdora: Centar protiv progona15

I u Nemačkoj, Poljskoj, Češkoj se žurko diskutira o planiranom Centru protiv progona koji predstavlja pokušaj nove kontekstualizacije prošlosti kroz njeno uzdizanje na evropski nivo. On sa sobom nosi drugačije, ali ne manje kontroverzne probleme. S liberalne i kritičke strane postavljen zahtev da se ova tema stavi u evropski kontekst, u nadi da će tako poći za rukom da se smiruje i izolovane emoциjno nabijeni međudržavni, susetski odnosi, preti se da okrene u svoju suprotnost. Izcep papela jednog posve drugačijeg diskursa o istorijama progona u Europi izvire jedan novi model tumačenja po kome najkasnije počev od 19. veka i procesa posnetog kot „nation building“ etnička čišenja bivaju spravod莲e na svih strana. Masovni i brutalni progona milijona Nemaca nakon Drugog svetskog rata u ovom svetlu više nije primarna posledica nacionalno-socijalističkih zločina. Ovi zločini su stoga, shodno stanovništvu nekih pre svega konzervativnih istoričara, poslužli kao

15 http://www.z-g-v.de/index_noflash.html (prim. prev.)
ing to some, mainly conservative historians, those crimes served as a welcome justification for ethnic cleansings planned long before with no consideration for those affected and under the most brutal conditions. Of course, this standpoint also includes pointing out the cooperation of totalitarian dictatorships – a fishhook gladly swallowed in many states of Eastern and Central Europe today.15

Memorial Sites and their Tasks: Nine Principles

Memorial sites have a great responsibility. They must protect the victims’ honor from any form of assimilation and remain open for interpretation of the past if they aim to urge critical and independent thought about history as opposed to affirmatively conserve alleged lessons from the past.

Therefore, it is my opinion that it is high time for memorial sites and historical museums to communicate and join forces both nationally and internationally. Only together can they resist the attempts of political instrumentalization in a Europe which attempts to overcome its comprehensive and deeply-rooted crisis of sense and identity by a policy of history which establishes new attempts of political instrumentalization in a Europe which at sites and historical museums to communicate and join forces both conserve alleged lessons from the past.

There is therefore a need for a motion which is brought in connection with a resolution on further development of the concept of memorial sites. The motion, which is shown by a German Bundestag discussion on Memorial Sites and their Tasks: Nine Principles. The motion, which is shown by a resolution on further development of the concept of memorial sites. The motion, which is brought in connection with the German Bundestag debate, was seen by the victims’ honor from any form of assimilation and remain open for interpretation of the past if they aim to urge critical and independent thought about history as opposed to affirmatively conserve alleged lessons from the past.

Es ist daher nach meiner Ansicht höchste Zeit, dass sich die Gedenkstätten und zeithistorischen Museen national ebenso wie international verständigen und zusammenschließen. Nur gemeinsam können sie den Versuchen politischer Instrumentalisation in einem Europa widerstehen, das seine umfassende und tief greifende Sinn- und Identitätskrise durch die geschichtspolitische Setzung neuer kollektiver, zum Teil per Dekret geschaffener Erinnerungskulturen zu überwinden versucht, was im Effekt vor allem die Deutungskämpfe und Opferkonkurrenzen erheblich und bedenklich verschärft. Der für den internationalen Zusammenschluss erforderliche organisatorische Rahmen wurde dafür bereits geschaffen. Vor wenigen Jahren gegründete Internationale Committee of Memorial Sites (IC MEMO) ist durch die Einbindung in den International Council of Museums (ICOM) und das grundlegende ethische und politische Prinzip des UN Charter, zu observe human and civil rights, as well as to take care of the inherited cultural assets. IC MEMO is an umbrella organization for various memorial sites for victims of state dictatorships from Asia to Europe and from Africa to America. The new possibilities of such international networking of memorial sites, including even the influence on political decisions on the macrolevel, was shown by a German Bundestag discussion on a motion for a resolution on further development of the concept of memorial sites. The motion, which is brought in connection with the name of a then CDU Bundestag deputy, was seen by the victims’ honor from any form of assimilation and remain open for interpretation of the past if they aim to urge critical and independent thought about history as opposed to affirmatively conserve alleged lessons from the past.


most organizations of Nazi victims and experts on memorial sites as attempt of blending different persecution complexes. It was successfully followed through international help, mainly initiated by IC MEMO.

However, memorial sites need more than a joint organization and better international networkin. Moreover, they should communicate about basic principles of commemoration and remembrance. At the same time, it cannot be a matter of prescribing a form of “DIN-standard of remembrance”, as ironically formulated by Timothy Gardon Ash, but rather of setting in motion a European or international process of self-commitment regarding memorial sites. A form of international memorial sites-charter, oriented towards principles of the UN Declaration, as well as ethical principles of ICOM, could be helpful in the process. I will try to word a few general principles which seem sensible to me, as an attempt of stimulating a collective discussion among international memorial sites:

1. A common European culture of remembrance cannot and must not be prescribed by decree. In view of different historical experiences, memorial sites commit to a coexistence of different memorial imperatives within a pluralized culture of remembrance which is pursued in a mutual dialogue, rather than for the purpose of a battle over interpretation or suppression. A collective European culture of remembrance, should it prove worthwhile, could slowly emerge from the bottom up from the multitude of decentralized initiatives.

2. The pluralist culture of remembrance also needs a common positive value framework. It already exists in the Universal Declaration of Human and Civil Rights. Additional deductions or other forms of creating meaning are not required.

3. Memorial sites and historical museums primarily memorialize state crimes which were committed predominantly against minorities. Therefore, states and governments bear particular responsibility for memorial sites, they must guarantee for their contents as well as for their ongoing independence of political directives. At the same time, memorial sites need to be as

ones Entschließungsantrages im Deutschen Bundestag zur Weiterentwicklung der Gedenkstättenkonzeption. Der mit dem Namen eines damaligen CDU-Bundestagsabgeordneten verbundene Vorstoß, der von den meisten NS-Opferorganisationen und Gedenkstättenexperten als ein Versuch zur Vermischung unterschiedlicher Verfolgungskomplexe empfunden wurde, konnte mit internationaler Hilfe, die vom IC MEMO maßgeblich initiiert worden war, erfolgreich abgewehrt werden.


3. Gedenkstätten und zeitgeschichtliche Museen erinnern vor allem an staatliche Verbrechen, die vorwiegend an Minderheiten begangen wurden. Staaten und Regierungen haben daher eine besondere Verantwortung für die Gedenkstätten, deren Bestand sie ebenso garantieren müssen wie ihre weitestgehende

koja se vezuje za ime jednog tadašnjeg CDU-odbornika, koju su tada većina organizacija žrtava nacionsosocializma i stručnjaci za memorijalne centre shvatili kao pokušaj da se pomešaju različiti kompleksi progona uspješno je sprečena uz pomoć međunarodne podrške, koju je presudno inicirala IC MEMO.

Memorijalnim centrima potrebna je ne samo jedna zajednička organizacija i bolja međunarodna umreženost. Povrh toga oni moraju da komuniciraju o opštim principima sećanja i komemoracije. Ali, to ujedno ne znači da treba sastaviti izvesnu DIN-normu komemoracije, kako je to Timoti Gordon Eš (Timothy Gordon Ash) ironično formulisao, već se radi o tome da se opoložen jedan evropski i međunarodni proces koji će kao rezultat imati da se sami centri obavežu na određene standarde. Neka vrsta međunarodne povelje o memorijalnim centrima koja bi se s jedne strane oslanjala na Povelju UN-a kao i na etičke principice ICOM-a bi u tom slučaju bila od pomoći. Nadalje ću pokušati da formulisem nekoliko osnovnih načela koja mi se čine smislenim, čime bih pokušao da otvorim diskusiju o standardima memorijalnih centara:

1. Zajednička evropska kultura sećanja ne može, ali i ne sme, da bude propisana nekom naređbom odgođo. S obzirom na različita istorijska iskustva memorijalni centri se obavezuju za naporednost različitih imperativa sećanja koji su u okviru pluralizovane kulture sećanja kojoj se nastoji u međusobnom dijalogu odnosno, a ne u službi borbe za tumačenjem ili poštivanjem. Zajednička evropska kultura sećanja, ukoliko se uopšte pokaže smislenom, može postojati samo u vidu mnoštva decentralizovanih inicijativa koje se odozdo na gore lagano razvijaju.


3. Memorijalni centri i istorijsku muzeje predv su sećaju na državne zločine koji su izvršeni nad manjinskim grupama. Stoga je odgovornost država i vlasti da nose posebnu odgovornost za memorijalne centre, čiji opstanak moraju da garantuju kao i njihovu što je moguće veću samostalnost od političkih
broadly as possible embedded in civil society and integrate minorities in their work.

4. Modern memorial sites are historical museums with specific tasks in terms of humanitarianism and educational policy. Only if a particular, internationally recognized level of qualitative work and personal organization is reached, can memorial sites stand up to political representatives and interest groups.

5. Content-related, pedagogic and creative fundamental decisions regarding memorial sites should be reached mostly on the basis of an open, power-free and pluralistic discussion with survivors, scientists, representatives of interest groups and involved social groups. State institutions or private sponsors should influence those opinion-forming and coordination processes as little as possible.

6. Conveying of historical events through exhibitions, publications and pedagogic programs should awaken empathy for the victims, without simultaneously activating the “malign potential of memories in the shape of revenge, hatred and resentment”.16

7. Historical experiences must be categorized in historical contexts, without relativizing the personal suffering of an individual. The classification of historical events takes place on the level of modern historical research, owing to scientific principles of discoursivity and multiperspectivity. This includes showing the perspective of the culprits without demonizing them, but rather explaining their methods through their respective ideologies, goals and motives. The ability to challenge one’s own point of view also includes the willingness to take into account what was described by Reinhard Koselleck as “negative history”, i.e. one’s own crimes, as well as self-image in the representation of the “other”.

8. Memorial sites at authentic historical places of crimes open great possibilities for political and historical education, but also great risks. That is why memorial sites should aim their educational work less at consensual contents, but at common principles as formulated, for example, in the so-called Beutelsbach foundational work less at consensual contents, but at common principles as formulated, for example, in the so-called Beutelsbach.


8. Gedenkstätten an den historisch-authentischen Ort der Verbrechen eröffnen für die historisch-politische Bildung sowohl große Chancen als auch große Risiken. Gedenkstätten sollten ihre Bildungsarbeit daher weniger an konsensuellen Inhalten interessierte Istovremeno memorijalni centri treba da budu duboko ukorenjeni u civilnom društvu i da angažuju upravo manjine u svom rad.

4. Moderni memorijalni centri su istorijski muzeji sa posebnim humanitarnim i obrazovno-političkim zadatkom. Jedino ako se dosegne određeni, međunarodno priznati nivo kvalitetnog rada kao i lične organizacije, memorijalni centri mogu biti u mogućnosti da se suprotstave političkim zastupnicima određenih interesa.

5. Sadržišne, pedagoške i načelne formalne odluke treba donositi pre svega na osnovu otvorenog, neupravljanog i pluralističkog dijaloga sa preživelim, naučnicima, raznim interesnim grupama i angažovanim društvenim grupama. Državne institucije ili privatni sponzori ne bi trebalo da utiču na procese donošenja odluka.

6. Pri prikazivanju istorijskih događaja u okviru izložbi, publikacija i pedagoških projekata treba raditi na budućem empatije sa žrtvama a da se pritom vodi računa „da se ne aktiviraju maligni potencijali sećanja u vidu osvete, mržnje i resantimana.“17

7. Istorjska iskustva moraju da se stavljaju u istorijski kontekst a da se pritom ne relativizuje lična patnja svakog pojedinca. Kontekstualizacija istorijskog događaja vrši se na osnovu savremenih istorijskih istraživanja i podleže naučnim principima diskurzivnosti i multiperspektivizmu. To se odnosi i na predstavljanje perspektive počinioća koji ne smeju biti demonizuovani, već njihovi postupci moraju biti prikazani s obzirom na ideologiju, ciljeve i motive koji su ih uslovili. Uspособност da sopstvenu perspektivu preispitamo spada i spremnost da se, kako je Reinhard Kozelek (Reinhard Koselleck) to nazvao, „negativna istorija“ takođe uzme u obzir, tj. da se tematizuju kako sopstveni zločini kao i „slika nas samih“ u očim „drugih“. 

8. Memorijalni centri na autentičnim istorijskim mestima zločina otvaraju za istorijsko-političko obrazovanje kake veće mogućnosti tako i velike rizike. Memorijalna mesta bi stoga trebalo svoj obrazovni rad da orijentšu na konsenzusne

16 A. Assmann, Der lange Schatten, p. 267.
14 A. Assmann, Der lange Schatten, S 267.
17 A. Assmann, Der lange Schatten, str. 267.
Consensus in 2017. These are mainly the bans on overpowering and indoctrination, protection of the individual's subjective position, as well as the command of controversy.

9. Memorial sites and historical museum face the jeopardy of reflecting temporary trends of the current Zeitgeist, thus providing a current interpretation of the past instead of narrating concrete historical events. Therefore, they should always self-critically reflect their own respective history, which is part of a history of the specific culture of remembrance.

Das "Vermächtnis" der Überlebenden


17 This agreement created a theoretical framework for political education in the Federal Republic of Germany. It is based on three postulates: 1. Ban on indoctrination; 2. Whatever is controversial in science and politics must be thematized as such in the educational process, as well; 3. The student must be stimulated to understand a certain historical situation in its context and analyze his/her attitude towards it. (translator’s note)

it, with all its bright and dark sides; every member state should know about its own mistakes and failures, recognize them and be at peace with its own past, in order to be able to be at peace with its neighbors, as well.\textsuperscript{18}

Reinen zu sein, um auch mit seinen Nachbarn im Reinen sein zu können.\textsuperscript{19}

\textsuperscript{18} Legacy ("Vermächtnis") was frequently published and is also included on many concentration camp memorials’ websites. The text was printed in, e.g: Gegen Vergessen. Für Demokratie, May 2009, pp. 14-19, specifically p. 18.
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