



Silencing Citizens through Censorship, Learning from Europe's 20th-century dictatorial and totalitarian past

Project acronym: SCC

RESULTS OF THE FIRST DEVELOPMENT MEETING

BOLOGNA, ITALY
22-24 JANUARY, 2015



Contact person: Aysel Gojayeva (+31614613595, aysel@euroclio.eu)
EUROCLIO office: +31703817836



Co-funded by the
Europe for Citizens Programme
of the European Union





EVENT REPORT

SECTION I: Executive summary of the 1st development meeting (pages 1-8).

SECTION II: Decisions and tasks resulted from the development meeting (see annex “tasks & decisions”).

SECTION I: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

From **21 till 24 January 2016**, members of the SCC project team convened in a historical town Bologna. Instituto Parri was the co-organizer of this meeting together with EUROCLIO. The meeting was participated by **Martin Liepach** (VGD), **Enrico Cavaliere** (Instituto Parri), **Maria Laura Marescalchi** (Instituto Parri), **Caroline Morel** (APHG), **Harri Beobide** (IE), **Jacek Staniszewski** (IBE), **Mire Mladenovski** (HTA Macedonia), **Bisera Srceva** (HTA Macedonia), **Vodli Zsolt** (HTA Hungary), **Jonathan Even-Zohar** (EUROCLIO), **Aysel Gojayeva** (EUROCLIO), and **Steven Stegers** (EUROCLIO). The meeting in Bologna was the first development meeting of the project and embedded in itself demonstration of the source materials under enquiry questions, piloting workshop for local teachers in Italy and management meeting. Below, there is a more detailed summary of each activity.

Statistics:

- **9 Core Team Members**
- **3 EUROCLIO Staff Members**
- **7 Presentations**
- **3 Workshops**
- **1 Management Meeting**

1st Day - Development meeting

The 1st development meeting aimed at presenting the selection of the sources identified for each enquiry questions agreed in The preparatory meeting (The Hague, October 2015), collecting feedback and suggestions of the project team on further development of draft materials, piloting/testing draft materials among local educators through an active workshop and collecting feedback on the content and use of the source materials and eventually agreeing on the next steps and framework of the development of the educational material.

The meeting started with reflections of the project team on the challenges encountered by them in the course of selection of sources.

Following this session, the team members worked hard to present selection of 2 sources under each enquiry question identified in the Hague meeting.

Enquiry questions identified in the Hague meeting:

- What was censored and why?
- What were the tools and methods to censor and to avoid being censored?
- Who is involved and affected, and how?
- Who is involved and affected, and how?
- What is the legacy?

Presentations of country cases

Vodli Zsolt	- "Censorship and 1956"
Caroline Morel	- "Censorship in Vichy France"
Martin Liepach	- "Censorship in Nazi Germany, 1933-1945"
Harri Beobide	- "Francoist dictatorship in Spain (1936-75)"
Enrico Cavalieri & Maria Laura Marescalchi	- "Censorship during Mussolini dictatorship"
Mire Mladenovski & Bisera Srceva	- "Censorship in Tito's Yugoslavia"



Specific issues (from the KQ)

- What was censored and why is a contextual question. Sources here should perhaps be only those that allow student to understand the baseline (ideological) motives of the regime
- Propaganda features strongly as another side of the same coin of the regime's efforts to manipulate communication and information in the public space (as Martin said: it legitimizes the action censor)
- Some of our topics contain quite complex political context to explain, how do we maintain student-centeredness, perhaps the theme is too wide and focus is needed, for example on the experience of everyday life?

present their initial ideas on learning activities and their development strategy.

More details about the next steps are available in section two of this document.

Summary of achievements

- Wide variety of source materials
- Rich context that allows comparative approach to the topic of censorship and life in totalitarian regimes (music, morals, consequences, legacy, etc)
- Enquiry Questions structure helped us to cover a lot of ground, but some questions were more difficult than others (legacy, bigger picture)

The presented selection by each partner involved very interesting sources and ideas for the learning activities. Each team member could record their remarks and suggestions in an online form in order not to distract the presenter. The guiding questions for the feedback were built around a few criteria as the relevance of the selected sources for the enquiry questions and the suitability of sources for teaching. This way, the EUROCLIO managers will make the summary of the collected feedback and share it with the project team for the improvement of their materials. This day provided a solid ground for the planning of the next steps in the development of learning activities for the Historiana Unit. Before the next development meeting in Budapest, the team members will think what kind of learning enquiries they would like to develop and under which themes improve their source collections and possibly involve teachers in piloting of these materials. In line with this, the project team agreed on an online meeting between now and Budapest where they will



The challenges mentioned by the project team I summarized as:



Challenges

- How to take care of copyright clearance (e.g. audio-visual sources, movie posters etc.)
- How to find the balance between too much / not enough context - between birds-eye view and details
- *To find sources which can be interesting and relevant for European students, not only locals.*
- How to create student-centered and active learning workshops with the material (agree on outcomes)
- How to bridge the contexts to allow a thematic and transnational approach
- Would it be possible to define the 'degrees' of censorship?
- How to focus on legacy of censorship (e.g. street names, monuments to book burning, legal measures guaranteeing freedom of speech, archives of secret service etc.)
- Difficulty to look for sources without knowing the pedagogical activity.
- Difficult to access sources. It takes long time to get permission to use sources.

23 January - Workshop for local teachers

The aim of this workshop was to pilot the first selection of source materials in the project and collect feedback of local educators. The workshop attracted 12 local teachers from primary and secondary schools. After the first day which helped the team to get a better understanding on each other's source materials and historical context, next day the project members worked in teams and brainstormed about ideas for learning activities based on presented sources from the previous day. The selection was transnational and presented in the form of active workshops to intrigue discussion and collect feedback. The presented learning activities were:



Workshop 1: *How to become a good censor, with the focus on the rules of the censor* (presented by **Jacek Staniszewski, Caroline Morel and Harri Beobide**)
This workshop presented sources on rules of law during the Mussolini regime, sources from the 70's in Poland, and the dictatorship period in Spain. After the analysis of the sources, the participants had to review a newspaper from the present day and apply censorship rules of the described times in the modern newspaper and state their opinion why they do so.

Workshop 2: *Book burnings* (presented by **Martin Liepach, Vodli Zsolt and Bisera Srceva**).
This workshop presented pictures of book burning events and a list of censored books in different totalitarian and dictatorship regimes as a common practice of censorship, and involved participants to think around questions 'when, where and why' and look into the consequences, the legacy and the bigger picture.

Workshop 3: *Dangerous arts* (presented by **Enrico Cavaliere and Mire Mladenovski**)
This workshop took songs, poems and cartoons which were subject to censorship and/or proganda. The key focus of the workshop was looking at the types of arts subject to censorship and its consequences. As a part of this workshop participants were involved in two exercises in which they had to convey their message in a hidden way as well as choose between original cartoons and the falsified ones.

The feedback of the local teachers were framed around the following questions:

- Are the sources interesting and relevant for your teaching?
- Do these sources form good comparable material?
- What else do you need in order to use these materials with your students?

The workshops aimed to share the early stage of the development of materials, and collect feedback of teachers in further improvement and enrichment of the sources and methods. The workshops were evaluated high and received a lot of useful inputs and remarks.

More descriptively, in their evaluations, participants assessed positively the fact that they learned about ways and methods to teach the topic of censorship in an interactive and engaging ways to students through visual sources. Participants who work at the primary level stressed the importance to prepare materials which can be also applicable for the primary level students. The importance of providing more historical context was also mentioned as an important element of learning activities.

These suggestions were noted as something to keep in mind during the piloting of further developed learning activities.

The project team will continue to further improving their selection of sources and prepare the framework of development of learning activities over the course of coming months. In the 2nd development meeting, the team will present more solid learning materials and complete source collections as well as pilot it with the local teachers in Hungary.

24 January – Introduction to learning outcomes & management meeting

The morning part of the 24th of January was dedicated to the introduction to learning outcomes of the learning activities at the [Historiana](#) website and management meeting. Before starting this management session, Steven Stegers (EUROCLIO Programme Director, Historiana Manager) introduced and explained the team to the format and logic of learning outcomes at the Historiana website. This was very useful for the project team to be familiarized with before they design their learning activities. The management meeting aimed to agree on next steps, time-plan and deliverables at the Budapest meeting. A series of decisions and tasks were discussed and made for the coming couple of month. The planning of tasks before the 2nd Development meeting was made. The team agreed on the timetable.





The next development meeting of the project will take place in **Budapest** (9-12 June 2016).

See the more detailed results and timetable from the development and management meeting in section II of this report made available for the team members only.