Banned Books Seminar Analysis
Seminar Team: Kristlin Ringas, Liisa Toonekurg

The final seminar follows mostly the "skeleton seminar" we made and has only a couple of changes but the general structure of the seminar stayed the same. Before the seminar, we added one more group activity but other parts stayed mostly the same. We purposefully made the "skeleton seminar" flexible so that additions can be added and discussions can be longer.

The seminar started with the short introductions of the participants and Joe introduced the Banned Books Museum, which we had mentioned in the "skeleton seminar".
He explains differences between banned, burned and censored books and shows examples. In the "skeleton seminar", we only had a brief explanation of what book censorship is. They discuss editing versus censorship and "Charlie and the Chocolate Factory" is given as an example, which we also had in our "skeleton seminar".
After this, they had the first game: Categories, where they were given book cards and had to put them in different categories. Participants were split into two groups. One group got banned, burned, censored and the other Russia, China, USA. They really liked this game and would like to use it themselves.
Before the break Joe introduces the basic idea of 7 censorships and why we need them. This model is created by the Banned Books Museum so it is unique but that also means that it is not easily findable. As this is a lot of information, it is important to not tire them out so after this we placed the break. After the break, Joe explains each censorship method and gives examples of books for each of these.
Then they have another group activity: Guess why the book was banned, where they get a book and have to guess for what reason it had been banned. It gets a little out of control but becomes a bigger conversation. Originally we didn't have this game in the "skeleton seminar". However, it was a success as it created discussion so we will likely keep it in the future seminars.

Last part of the seminar was a group discussion. The participants were split into two groups and talked about two topics, where they could focus on either or both:
1. Does 7 censorship model we discussed apply to your country?
2. What can we do to protect authors from each form of censorship?
This part was supposed to be longer but everyone was tired, so they ended early. Maybe the future seminars on this topic could be a bit shorter so it's less tiring. Since most participants had little knowledge of banned authors/titles in Romania, they had difficulty applying it. However, they had some interesting perspectives on the Communist period and talked about that time.
The last group activity was shorter than planned, since everyone was a bit tired but they were still enthusiastic about it. Although they had difficulty answering the question due to lack of knowledge about the topic, they shared their personal experiences on restrictions in Communist period. This is good to know as it could be the case in other Post-Soviet countries too.

We decided to add more group activities to engage the audience with the topic more and use the information they got from the seminar itself and what they already know. Also we wanted the seminar to be more interactive and fun for the audience to participate in. The audience participated in all of the group activities we made and had fun while also learning more about the topic. As our main goal was to create discussions on censorship more than giving information, the activities helped facilitate that greatly. Additionally, it shows that the information from the Co-Creation team was not wrong as not much was known by the librarians and that the three hour seminar can be tiring.

Even though the Romanians can also speak in English, they were encouraged to speak in Romanian, so that we can know the difficulties with translation. Translating takes up time and we wanted to have a trial run with translation to see the timing with translating Joe, which has not been taken into full account in the "skeleton seminar" timings.
For filming future projects like this, there should be two cameras to have better quality videos.
The Romanian seminar has already been used as an example seminar to promote the seminar to other libraries and there has been an interest through that. Also recording and archiving is an important tool against censorship, so having future seminars recorded is an extension of the museum's ideals.

Overall, the seminar went very well, was successful and a great sample for how future seminars will go and what areas will be focused on. The seminar structure is moldable and so the timings can differ, meaning each seminar will be different and the discussions can vary greatly especially when the seminar is done in different countries. There was much discussion by the librarians and promises to keep the conversations going, which is the main goal of the seminar.