

				
			International Historical, Educational Nongovernmental organization "INTERNATIONAL HISTORICAL, EDUCATIONAL, CHARITABLE AND HUMAN RIGHTS SOCIETY MEMORIAL" 127051 Moscow, 12 Maly Karetny Lane (495) 650-7883, fax (495) 609-0694 e-mail: <a href="mailto:nipc@memo.ru">nipc@memo.ru</a> , <a href="http://www.memo.ru">http://www.memo.ru</a>	
			No	MM-742
			Date	11/11/2011

**REPORT**  
**About Activities of International Historical, Educational Nongovernmental Organization "International Historical, Educational, Charitable and Human Rights Society Memorial"**  
**From October 1, 2001 through September 30, 2010**  
**Agreement No. 118-A-00-02-00178**

The U. S. Agency for International Development (USAID) awarded 2,522,111 U.S. Dollars to the non-governmental non-profit organization *Memorial* Historical, Educational, Human Rights and Charitable Society ("International Memorial") under Cooperative Agreement 118-A-00-02-00178 dated September 27, 2002 and Modifications Nos. 1-8. This amount was expended on several programs administered by International Memorial:

1. **Reaching the Russian Public: Strategies For Increasing the Demand for Protection of Human Rights** (the initial period was from October 1, 2002 through March 26, 2004 with an award of USD 630,000; Mod. 3 increased the award to USD 705,000 and extended the program period until November 30, 2004; Mod. 4 increased the award to USD 785,000 and extended implementation period until July 31, 2005);
2. **Young Human Rights Activists and Social Marketing in Russia:** from August 1, 2005 through July 31, 2008 (as stated in Mod. 5 dated June 17, 2005 and Mod. 6 dated June 16, 2006);
3. **Building a Civil Historical & Cultural Center in Moscow as the Hub for Educational Work with the Russian Regions** (September 1, 2007 – September 30, 2010, Mod 7. dated September 25, 2007 and Mod. 8 dated September 20, 2009). Funding of this program amounted to USD 1,250,000.

This is the final report which covers the entire period of funding from October 1 2002 through September 30, 2010.

**Key deliverables from the project "Reaching the Russian Public: Strategies For Increasing the Demand for Protection of Human Rights"**

The goal of this project was to build the Russians' conscious approach to human rights and increase their demand for the protection of their rights.

The project was to pursue these goals through the following objectives:

- To increase Russians' awareness of human rights.
- To change the Russian citizens' attitude to some HR issues.
- To arrange training with a view to developing skills and alternative strategies of the media with respect to HR activists.
- To facilitate cooperation between HR activists in the center and the regions.
- To facilitate cooperation between HR NGOs and media NGOs.

Information-sharing campaigns were held in three Russian regions: Perm, Rostov and Ryazan oblasts.

Campaigns in these oblasts were held along different lines depending on the specific profile of a given region:

- Advocacy of children with special needs (orphans) and a public campaign "Child's Day"; the target audience included adults (aged 22 and older, mostly teachers and parents), and indirect target audience included children under 17 (Perm oblast – as part of the megaproject for children);
- Increased awareness of the young people aged 16-24 about human rights and ways of their advocacy: the right to freedom of movement, right to education, right to citizenship, right to freedom from humiliating or cruel treatment (including tortures). The project was implemented in Taganrog, Novocherkassk and Rostov-on-Don (at the start of the project Rostov oblast faced particular problems related to respect of human rights by the young people and discrimination of people on the grounds of ethnic origin, age, social status, etc.; the value of human life declined in this region);
- A PR campaign in Ryazan was focused on the rising of people's protest against the war in Chechnya. The topic of this campaign was unfavorable for this region because of nationalistic views in the city.

Accordingly, the program employed different awareness-building campaign methods that had been developed with regard of the target audiences' specific profiles:

- Actions (TV show "An Oblast-Wide Parents' Meeting"; promotion action "I Have Rights" and "Children Must Live in a Family;" a competition of school students' essays; series of TV programs "Extracurricular Lessons;" festivals "Child's Day;" a competition for journalists for the best coverage of issues related to the advocacy of children's rights; billboards "Children Must Live in a Family" in the city areas; information-sharing stickers "How to Become a Foster-Care Tutor" on public transport; audio reels (wired by radio stations); video reels; pocketbook calendars "I Have Rights");
- Tests, quiz games in radio programs, video reels, booklets on HR issues, round-table sessions of topics related to the respect of human rights; and public consultation rooms for the young people;
- Mini-newspapers, dissemination of antiwar flyers, drafting of scripts for mass-scale street actions that were to draw the public's attention to the costs of the war in Chechnya and to the deaths of young people in the war.

Outcomes:

- Handout kits were prepared for all events;
- About 30 work meetings, workshops and trainings were held during the campaign;

- Five issues of mini-newspapers came out (total circulation: 160,000), and 9,000 leaflets were dispensed;
- 698 consultations on law and psychological counseling were provided (by phone and via the Internet);
- TV shows and TV programs had about 200,000 viewers;
- The competition of essays received papers from 364 school students from 12 cities and townships;
- All project-related campaigns were covered in many media and supported by web-based resources;
- Members of various NGOs met many times during proactive preparation of the project events to discuss the algorithm and methods of cooperation in order to draft and implement the common project effectively; this promoted the development of the regional human rights community;
- Indirect targeted audiences of the project (such as the city governments, journalists, young people and members of the business community) were involved in proactive work. One notable feature of this project was close collaboration both with the oblast-level government and with the federal authorities (by an agreement with Alexander Pochinok, Minister of Labor and Social Development, Perm oblast was a federal-level pilot platform in the advocacy of orphan children).

### **Key deliverables from the project “Young Human Rights Activists and Social Marketing in Russia”**

The goal of this project was to inform the young Russians about violations of human rights and change their attitude to this problem; and promote the core values of the present-day democratic society which are marketed by International Memorial. The target audience includes young people aged 16-24.

#### **Objectives:**

- To recruit and train the new generation of HR advocates;
- To expand opportunities for social marketing campaigns as a method of presenting changes in the society to the younger generation of HR advocates;
- To run campaigns that would expose many young Russians to International Memorial’s core values.

#### **Outcomes:**

1. Sixty-two participants took part in the project: 37 in Komi and 25 in Tula.
2. Eleven workshops and working meetings were held, with more than 70 participants in total.
3. Sixty-seven focus groups were held on testing of a communication strategy for a PR campaign, newspaper issues and scripts for talk shows.
4. Twenty-two issues of the regional newspaper “Tvoe vremya [Your Time] came out (total circulation: 21,978 copies). The newspaper carried 154 articles and materials, held 22 quizzes in which 115 young people took part, and increased subscription by almost fourfold (900 subscribers in May 2008).
5. Additional copies of issues Nos. 18, 21, and 22 were published and disseminated (2,000 copies of each issue in Syktyvkar and 1,000 copies of each issue in Ukhta).

6. Thirteen issues of newspaper *MPeG* (Tula) were published, 999 copies each. Other issues (Nos. 14-17) were posted on the website of the project at <http://www.mpg.ucoz.ru/>.
7. Fifty-five meetings were held (round-table sessions, debate club sessions, and film club meetings for young people); more than 300 people participated.
8. One hundred and three talk shows were held (topics: “What to do if a policeman has come up to me,” “The right to private life,” “Year 1937” and “Technologies of non-violence”) in which 2,473 young people participated proactively;
9. Website "Young People of the Komi Republic" was launched during the project. Website had 6,900 visitors; it published 104 articles, and there were 1,730 posts on its forum.
10. Website <http://www.mpg.ucoz.ru/> received 581 posts; its forum has 35 permanent visitors.
11. 446 information-sharing posters about the PR campaign were disseminated in 129 educational institutions.
12. An information-sharing campaign was run on public transport.
13. Souvenir calendars bearing information about the campaign topics and addresses of International Memorial’s offices in Komi were distributed in educational institutions of Ukhta and Syktyvkar, together with additional copies of *Tvoe vremya* newspaper (1,000 copies in Ukhta and 2,000 copies in Syktyvkar) through a special service *Iz ruk v ruki* [From Hand To Hand].
14. Twenty issues and 88 announcements of *Tvoe vremya* thematic program came out; they bore the campaign slogan “Learn How to Communicate With the Police Correctly!” and the address of website "Young People of the Komi Republic".

### **Key deliverables from the project “Building a Civil Historical & Cultural Center in Moscow as the Hub for Educational Work with the Russian Regions”**

The project had two main goals:

1. To support reconstruction and renovation of the multi-purpose civil historical and cultural center in Moscow in order to increase public access to Memorial’s archives and educational programs and strengthen long-term sustainability of Memorial.
2. To strengthen institutional capacity and management structure of Memorial’s regional network in order to expand the reach and impact of the regional-level educational programs, outreach and human rights advocacy and defense.

#### **A. Reconstruction of Educational Center (Dom Memoriala)**

In the reporting period Memorial completed restoration of the building that accommodates its awareness-building center (Dom Memoriala) and made preparations for it to operate as the civil-society, cultural, educational, museum, archive, library, and debate center in Moscow:

- Assignments were outlined for MOSZHILNIIPROJECT (this organization was selected after a tender) to make technical inspection of the building and draft an engineering plan for refurbishing of the building, rearrange its façade decoration and develop the adjacent area; design plans were coordinated with the

authorities at all levels (this was the most costly and labor-consuming part of the project); and implementation of design plans was monitored;

- Assignments were outlined for making a design projects of a an exhibition hall and museum area, re-planning and accommodation of office rooms, and for façade arrangement (these were coordinated with the residents of the house where Dom Memoriala is located);
- A tender was held for the selection of construction firms, and construction works were completed in accordance with the project documentation (over 80 pages of drawings and documents) for reconstruction of Memorial’s premises;
- Environmental review was conducted (as had been planned for this project). It was based on the design documentation package and a plan of actions for sanitary and epidemiological welfare in the refurbished building (the plan was coordinated with the federal healthcare institution “Center of Hygiene and Epidemiology”);
- Actions were taken for making the office rooms, museum and exhibition areas accessible for the disabled: an assignment for the appropriate solution was drafted and sent to the project organization; special equipment was bought (via tender) and installed, so that visitors with disabilities could have access to the building. Building of special access ramps was a challenging task because of Russian land legislation; therefore, Memorial had to have additional consultations and obtain additional approvals;
- Memorial made a market survey and obtained commercial offers for the procurement of up-to-date equipment for storing archival and library collections. To date, all equipment has been purchased and installed, museum and library collections have been transported, and Memorial is accommodating them in the new premises;
- Dom Memorial has emergency fire extinguishing systems and fire and security alarm systems that meet the latest requirements. Administrative and IR staff has been trained on how to operate this equipment, and there is a plan to train all employees of Memorial on how to use the fire and security systems correctly.
- Preparations began for Dom Memoriala to operate as a large educational center. Several meetings and consultations were held with partner organizations to discuss joint events in the new premises. Dom Memoriala has been fully commissioned as a cultural center in accordance with the plan.

## **B. Strengthening of Memorial’s Regional Network**

During implementation of the project Memorial focused on two objectives:

1. Work of a special outlet for providing consultations on legal and financial matters at the Board of Memorial in Moscow (staff member of Memorial + fee-based consultations on the most complicated issues by the leading Moscow professionals);

A professional consultation service worked in the reporting period at the Board of Memorial. It consulted regional organizations on accounting and legal matters related to these organizations’ activities. In particular, advisory support was provided when organizations filed their statements with the registration authorities and when they were audited by the tax and registration authorities. Audits were completed successfully as a result, with comments about minor weaknesses that were corrected without any particular implications.

2. Network educational projects for groups of citizen activists with a view to strengthening their motivation for more proactive participation in the HR advocacy.

The project “Creating Space for Public Debates in the Russian Regions and Strengthening the Sustainability of *Memorial* as a Network Organization” (hereinafter “Debate Project”) made the largest contribution to the achievement of this objective. The project received matched funding from OSI Assistance Foundation.

2.1. The Board of International Memorial oversaw the ongoing project activities and monitored their outcomes. Based on reports from the heads of regional Memorials, the Board analyzed and adjusted their work as required.

The Board met at least once every three or four months. It held 15 meetings in the reporting period. Each meeting discussed implementation status of projects. Based on a review of information, the Board concluded that regional organizations had been demonstrating a high level of activism and were on track with their plans and chartered goals and objectives.

Key topics for debates were discussed and adopted at the Board meetings:

- What is memory about the state terror and GULAG today.
- Terrorism and extremism: real and imaginary threats.
- Chechnya as a special point in the present-day political history of Russia: is it the struggle of elites or a conflict of ethnic groups in the post-soviet period?
- “Foreign” or “different”?
- Civil society and governmental institutions: are they partners or opponents?
- History and politics.

Four packages of materials for debates were compiled:

- 2007 (the start of the Project) was the year when the 70<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the “Great Terror” was marked. Therefore, the Board of International Memorial took a decision to make the first pack of materials on “Memory about the Terror.” Debates on this topic were held throughout the Debate Project. Most events were held in October (because October 30 is the Political Prisoner Day).
- “Foreign” or “different”?
- Civil society and governmental institutions: are they partners or opponents?
- A resource pack was compiled as support materials for debates, round-table sessions and other events. It was based on Internet publications about the new manual for history teachers (author: A. V. Filippov). The pack focused on two topics from the list that had been approved by the Board: “Memory about the Terror” and “History and Politics.” Teaching history at school has been a particularly important topic these days. This is not only because of coverage of terror and tendencies to rehabilitate Stalin. A new concept of the “happy past” and development of the “Russian identity” has been broadly advertised recently. It covers the entire course on history, particularly the 20<sup>th</sup> century. The resource pack was initiated by the regional coordinators of the Project (debates on this topic were held in Ukhta and St. Petersburg), and materials of regional debates were added to it throughout the Project.

New topics for discussion emerged during the Project. They are related either with the new forms (e.g., discussion of films – the first one was the discussion of *Katyn* by Andrzej Wajda, followed up by the compilation of a video film library) or with the new partners of the Project

(e.g., topic “The Army and the Society” was supported by the public initiative “Citizen and the Army”).

2.2. The main focus of the permanent consultation center was on advisory support to regional organizations. The center gave assistance related to the current issues of financial management in NGOs (a Project lawyer worked as a volunteer in the distant consulting mode, and some work was done by contractor and volunteer consultants). Advisory support was also provided to NGOs that developed their own awareness-building projects.

2.3. The Project’s advisory center in Moscow assisted with seminars and trainings (methodological recommendations and information sharing).

Fifteen meetings of the Debate Project coordinators were held during the award period. Coordinators met to discuss how to run debates in the regions, the most important topics of debates, how to achieve higher efficiency of their work with the audiences, how to encourage proactive participation of teachers and the young people in the Project, involve local public in the NGO projects and conduct trainings on media cultivation.

Attendees of the final seminar pointed out that the Project objective – to break isolation of Memorial and expand its partnership network in the regions and across Russia – had been broadly achieved.

In Moscow, Memorial focused on the expansion of its partnership contacts. Conferences “History of Stalinism” and “Khodorkovsky Readings,” joint projects on historical memory with the Friedrich Naumann Foundation and debates in the Gorbachev Foundation all worked toward this end.

2.4. Staff and advisory support to regional events was provided by the Project employees and volunteers who worked as experts and moderators of debates in the Russian cities.

The objectives of most travels in the reporting period were: (i) to send experts to the regions in order to support events there; and (ii) to analyze the organizational aspect of events (partners; preparation of the audience). These issues were later discussed at meetings of the Debate Project’s regional coordinators. A review of the Project experience in these issues is related to the importance of these issues both for the further activities and for implementation of other awareness-building projects.

Routine Project-related issues were also discussed by email.

2.5. Traveling exhibitions were one of the most effective ways for initiating a debate (see the list of exhibitions in *Annex 1*). Memorial tried to involve various exhibitions in the project – those that had been prepared internally, and those arranged by partner organizations. Presentations, meetings, debates and disputes were held in relation to exhibitions.

Besides, a small film library was created for the Debate Project: Memorial made a list of annotated films that were recommended for seeing and follow-up discussion. Recommendations about how to hold film-related debates were drawn up and sent to the regions (see *Annex 2*). Experience showed that films (as well as traveling exhibitions) are one of the most effective ways of initiating a debate.

2.6. One outcome of the Project was higher activism in the regions.

More than 700 events were held during the Project implementation period. These included debates, round-table sessions, presentations, seminars, lectures, exhibitions, talks, meetings and others.

The total audience of these events exceeded 6,000. Some of them took part in 3 or 4 events, so the actual number of participants is about 1,500, including more than 500 proactive contributors to events (particularly debates).

2.7. Higher activism of debaters in the regions and the development of partnerships with other organizations is one of important deliverables from the Project.

Various social groups took part in the Project events. Young people participated proactively (college, university and school students; volunteers; activists of NGOs and political movements). This was largely because the topics of events were important and interesting for the young people. The topics for debates (“Young Generation and Politics: Are We Really Far from Each Other?” and “Civil Society in Russia: Who Needs It?” (Perm), “Citizen and Army” and “What Is an Anti-Fa?” (Novocherkassk), “Your Place in the Russian Capitalism” and “Today’s Relations Between Russia and Ukraine: Neighbors, Friends or Enemies?” (Voronezh)) target the young people directly.

The main categories of participants are generally the same in all regions: schoolteachers, college and school students, NGO activists, members of associations of victims of political repressions, museum workers, librarians and people who had been subject to political repressions.

Some regional reports also named activists of the “Nashi” movement, members of the Communist Party of the Russian Federation, military school students, members of the regional and local authorities, ASF volunteers who take their “voluntary social year” in the Russian community organizations, young leaders of college and school student associations and journalists.

Political scientists, sociologists, historians, philosophy scholars, staff of the teacher skills development institutes, staff of the regional ombudsmen offices and various government officials acted as experts or active participants in the debates.

The Project further promoted regional-level contacts and cooperation with various organizations. The most frequent partners in the Project events were libraries, museums, schools, universities and NGOs. In particular, the regional reports mentioned: the Pomor State University, “Grani” club for public disputes, VOOPiK’s Center for Propaganda of Historical and Cultural Monuments, “Pomor Renaissance” center, members of the Armenian, Georgian, Kyrgyz, Lithuanian, Polish and Tatar diasporas, nongovernmental organization “Bogolyubsky Brotherhood” (Tver), Tver office of the Russian national movement “For Human Rights,” regional offices of Yabloko party and the United Civil Front, Tomsk community of Old Believers, Tomsk oblast Arts Center, Tomsk Muslim community, members of Esperanto Association of Chuvash Republic, heads of the historical archive of Chuvash Republic and State Archive of Technotronic Documentation of Chuvash Republic, members of pedagogical team “Cherdak” (Cheboksary) and others.

Teachers were eager to take part in discussing the problems of memory about the totalitarian past and debate about history being used as a tool. This happened despite the increased pressure of the official propaganda and the adverse attitude to the teachers’ participation in events run by Memorial.

2.8 Memorial continuously updated the topics of debates. The most successful scenarios of debates were employed many times. Scenarios were developed by coordinators and experts in the regions, in some cases with proactive support from the Moscow-based Consultation Center.

A review of the regional coordinators' performance showed that the following debate-like events are the most important ones in terms of goals and content:

1. A round-table session: different viewpoints are presented; the larger share of the audience is sufficiently well informed and has its own stance. The goal of such events is to have a free discussion of the socially relevant problem and develop communication of different social groups and organizations.
2. An "awareness-building session": coordinators and guest experts should outline their own vision of an issue but also provide general information in their presentations. The project coordinators tried to send information materials to the discussants in advance. The goal of the debate was not only to exchange opinions or develop a concerted viewpoint but encourage the participants to continue the discussion of the topic in their environment (in colleges, schools, research institutions and cultural organizations).

2.9. An important component of the Project activities was support of small-scale awareness-building events by volunteers. Project coordinators sometimes did not even take part in such events. Regional *Memorials* had 2 or 3 volunteers of the Project on average, and from 2 to 8 volunteers that take part in events. The composition of the volunteer pool and forms of their involvement were different. Institute students were activists of the discussion video club and other projects run by Memorial. Activists of other NGOs or political movements often worked as volunteers. Retirees that make the core of the local civil fronts cooperated with Memorial regularly. School teachers most often acted as volunteers who organized such event. In our view, proactive participation of volunteers proved that there was demand for the Project and that the Project was sustainable.

2.10. The Project events had broad media coverage. The media posted more than 500 publications and news items during implementation of the Project. Regional press (including the Internet media) published announcements, articles and stories about project events. Such events were covered by the local TV or radio programs in several regions.

However, some regions reported problems with the media coverage of the Project events. Coordinators said that media publications were not initiated at the request of the partner organizations that provided the venue for debates. Space was usually offered by schools and libraries (which is natural, given the target audience of the project). These are governmental institutions, and their management had sound reasons to believe that debates on acute topics would make local governments angry. This is why federal media carried more publications than regional one. There were problems with local newspapers because most of them are controlled by the local governments that are very hostile toward Memorial and its activities.

Digital technologies helped to address this problem. *Memorials* in Krasnoyarsk, Perm, St. Petersburg and Ukhta posted materials about their debates on their websites. In some regions information about Project-related events was posted on the partnership organizations' websites.

All coordinators of the Discussion Project were directly disseminating information about their work in the target audiences.

2.11. When the Project outcomes were discussed, most regional representatives pointed out that the following: the establishment of open debate platforms where various groups of the local public were and are meeting (teachers; activists of ethnic and cultural communities; school

students; people who suffered from political repressions) has promoted a dialogue, mutual interest and understanding among public groups who had seldom communicated with each other.

Regional coordinators reported:

- A sociological poll about the status of the civil society was held in Krasnoyarsk last year. It included a question ‘What community organizations operating in Krasnoyarsk krai do you know?’ It was a pleasant surprise for us to see that Krasnoyarsk Memorial was in the top three best known organizations – this is one outcome of the Debate Project.”
- “When I became involved in the Debate Project I saw a chance to reach villages, schools and those people who send out the new citizens to the society. This Project is absolutely necessary for my region.”
- “The Debate Project brought many new things in the work of our Memorial. It helped to expand the organization’s influence and involved a new social group, i.e. the young people – Memorial had not been working with this group for a long time. The printed media began talking about us, and we began giving presentations in other cities.”
- “The project brought us new opportunities and new partners. It became an integral project which bridged the existing islets of freedom”;
- “One of the largest benefits of the Debate Project is in that it encouraged us to talk about meanings”;
- “Memorial showed that it can be a uniting center which brings its meanings to various debates, from political to social ones.”

**Quantitative Project Indicators:  
September 1, 2007 – September 30, 2010**

##	Indicator	Number
1.	Board meetings that discussed the progress of this Project	15
2.	Materials packages for debates	4
3.	Seminar for activists of International Memorial’s awareness-building projects	7
4.	Participants in the seminar, including those from the regions	> 100 90
5.	Exhibitions displayed in the regions during the Project	8
6.	Annotated films (film library) recommended for seeing, with follow-up discussions	30
7.	Debate-like events (debates, round-table sessions, discussions of films, etc.)	> 500
8.	Presentations of exhibitions, books, CDs/DVDs and other intellectual products; lectures, seminars, conferences, pickets, guided tours, summer schools, meetings, in-memoriam parties, etc.	> 200
9.	Participants in the Project events	> 6,000
10.	Responses in the media	> 500

As planned, matched funding was provided for all Project activity areas.

*Elena B. Zhemkova*  
*Executive Director*