

Ethnic Cleansing, Genocide and Demographic Changes in Bosnia and Herzegovina

Muhidin Mulalic*

Abstract:

Different cultures, religions and traditions and hence multiculturalism represented in demographic diversity was strongly engraved in Bosnian cities, towns and villages. Different groups of people in Bosnia and Herzegovina shared diverse demographic space that ensured continuation of peace, equal opportunities, mutual tolerance, civil rights and multiethnic coexistence. This paper aims to articulate historical developments of Bosnian demographic diversity by especially taking into consideration the multicultural model and the developments during the 1990s. Then, it is significant to analyze the ethnic cleansing and genocide and how they have changed the demographic structure of the country, especially with regards to the existence of multiethnic cities, towns and villages. This paper explores ethnic cleansing and genocide as tools within the context of demographic changes, especially in the Serb controlled territories. How the ethnic cleansing and genocide were organized and carried out? What are the root-causes of ethnic cleansing and genocide that were deeply rooted in radical nationalist ideologies and projects? Why radical ethno-cultural national ideology was systematically used for cleansing the territories from the "other" "alien" ethnicities, nations and people? In-depth analysis of the demographic changes as a result of ethnic cleansing and genocide will be based on Bosnian population censuses of 1991 and of 2013. A comparative analysis will clearly demonstrate to what extent ethnic cleansing and genocide affected centuries old demographic diversity of Bosnian cities, towns and villages.

Keywords: Demography; Ethnic Cleansing; Genocide; Multiculturalism; Migrations

* Assoc. Prof. Dr., International University of Sarajevo, e-mail: mmulalic@ius.edu.ba

Introduction

The aggression against Bosnia and Herzegovina by Serbia culminated in a systematic and planned ethnic cleansing and genocide for the achievement of homogenous Serbian state. Ethnic cleansing and Srebrenica Genocide should be studied in the context of already existing international conventions on holocaust, crimes against humanity and genocide because such conventions were direct effect of post-World War II developments. It seems that the past experiences, the legal international framework and the humanitarian feelings failed in Srebrenica. Again after Srebrenica the world began to address the questions of crimes against humanity and genocide not only in Bosnia and Herzegovina but in countries where conflicts have already been taking place like in Iraq, Syria, Yemen, Palestine, Myanmar, Sri Lanka and Tibet. Therefore, the humanity is living in the fear of new genocides in spite of international conventions, legal framework, the world order and the will of the great powers and the international community to keep peace, stability and order.

Particularly, it is important to survey Srebrenica Genocide by considering its origins, causes, implications and post-genocide copying mechanisms. Srebrenica Genocide occurred on July 11, 1995 in spite of the fact that it was under the United Nations protection. From the humanitarian point of view the genocide was taking place in front of the eyes of the whole world. Then, from the political and legal points of view the international institutions, including the Security Council and the great powers were powerless. Although the international community had predicted the genocide, their inaction and lack of responsibility contributed towards killings of Bosniaks. Srebrenica Genocide has shown that genocide itself is a long process that is well-planned by the perpetrators and as such is very much recognizable. It includes clear ideological and political doctrines, genocide executors among politicians, generals and intellectual elites and measurable and legally proven acts of crimes. Srebrenica Genocide clearly indicated that it was not a separate, individual incidental act but well-planned, perpetuated act of the political establishment that had clear political doctrine, ideology and a systematic plan. For Srebrenica Genocide specific individuals, political parties, political leaders, military and paramilitary forces and above all the state of Serbia were significantly responsible. Therefore, only the highest political authorities can effectively envision, plan and instigate their citizens to demonstrate hatred towards others and to

use the state structure for committing actual crimes. However, in order to make territorial and demographic changes, the political authorities and its leadership made key decisions as to carry out systematic killings of targeted ethnic group in which more than 100,000 people were killed, 2.2 million people were displaced, 50,000 women raped, more than 1000 religious monuments destroyed and thousands of people were kept in concentration camps.¹

The Conception of Genocide

The word genocide was derived from the ancient Greek word *genos*, which means race or tribe and the Latin word *cide*, which means to kill. The conception of genocide is extremely complex and as such has several meanings. Due to its complexity, politicians, diplomats, lawyers, social scientists and the public at large have different views on what genocide is. The term genocide was introduced by Raphael Lemkin who was a lawyer, not a sociologist. Although he coined the term genocide, he also debated moral and legal dimensions of genocide within moral principles of just war theory. To him genocide was the extreme form of unjust war, aimed at national, ethnic and racial extermination.² Yet he placed the term genocide within political and military frame, not necessarily sociological. Explaining the notion of genocide, Lemkin (1944) in his book *Axis Rule in Occupied Europe: Laws of Occupation, Analysis of Government, Proposals for Redress*,³ in chapter IX argued that genocide as a term implies the destruction of one ethnic group and not necessarily of an entire nation. It involves an organized and coordinated plan of different actions, aimed at the destruction of the basic foundations of life of national groups. Such plan also aims at the breakdown of the public institutions, socio-

¹ See Norman M. Naimark, *Genocide: A World History*, Oxford: University Press, 2017, p. 128; Elisa von Joeden-Forgey, "Gender and Genocide." (pp. 61-81). In Bloxham Donald and Moses A. Dirk (Eds.). *The Oxford Handbook of Genocide Studies*. Oxford: University Press, 2010, pp. 69-72; Cathie Carmichael, "Genocide and Population Displacement in Post-Communist Eastern Europe." (pp. 509-529). In Bloxham Donald and Moses A. Dirk (Eds.). *The Oxford Handbook of Genocide Studies*. Oxford: University Press, 2010, 510-527; Robert M. Hayden, "Mass Killings and Images of Genocide in Bosnia 1941-5 and 1992-5." (487-517). In Stone Dan (Ed.). *The Historiography of Genocide*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2011, p. 487; Alexandra Stiglmyer, (Ed.). *Mass Rape: The War against Women in Bosnia-Herzegovina*. Lincoln, NB: University of Nebraska Press, 1995, p. 82-196.

² Christopher Powell, "What Do Genocides Kill? A Relational Conception of Genocide," *Journal of Genocide Research*. 2007. Vol. 9. No. 4., pp. 527-528; Michael Freeman, "Genocide, Civilization and Modernity." *The British Journal of Sociology*, 1995, Vol. 46. No. 2., pp. 209-211.

³ Rehael Lemkin, *Axis Rule in Occupied Europe*. Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1944.

political, cultural and religious symbols, economic sustenance and security and emotional, intellectual and psychological aspects of life without which the continuation of life of that particular ethnic group are made impossible.⁴ This is the reason why the scholars from different disciplines were studying crimes against humanity from biological, anthropological, racial and psycho-social perspectives.

Jones (2006), in his work *Genocide* enlisted the number of definitions of genocide which address *genocide's agents, victims, goals, scale, strategies and intent*. So genocide as such has theoretical and conceptual framework and it is not a simple sociological, historical, legal and political term.

For the sake of an illustration it is worth citing few definitions of genocide:

1. *Genocide is the deliberate destruction of physical life of individual human beings by reason of their membership of any human collectivity as such.*" Peter Drost (1959)

2. "[Genocide is] a structural and systematic destruction of innocent people by a state bureaucratic apparatus... Genocide represents a systematic effort over time to liquidate a national population, usually a minority . . . [and] functions as a fundamental political policy to assure conformity and participation of the citizenry." Irving Louis Horowitz (1976)

3. "Genocide is the deliberate destruction, in whole or in part, by a government or its agents, of a racial, sexual, religious, tribal or political minority. It can involve not only mass murder, but also starvation, forced deportation, and political, economic and biological subjugation. Genocide involves three major components: ideology, technology, and bureaucracy/organization." Jack Nusan Porter (1982)

4. "Genocide in the generic sense means the mass killing of substantial numbers of human beings, when not in the course of military action against the military forces of an avowed enemy, under conditions of the essential defencelessness of the victim." Israel Charny (1994)

5. "Genocides and politicides are the promotion, execution, and/or implied consent of sustained policies by governing elites or their agents – or, in the case of civil war, either of the contending authorities – that are intended to destroy, in whole or part, a communal, political, or politicized ethnic group." Barbara Harff (2003).⁵

⁴ Ann Curthoys and John Docker, "Defining Genocide." (pp. 9-41). In Stone Dan (Ed.) *The Historiography of Genocide*, New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2011, pp. 10-13.

⁵ Jones Adam, *Genocide: A Comprehensive Introduction*. London and New York: Routledge, 2006, 15-18.

On December 9, 1948, the United Nations adopted the *Convention on the Prevention of the Crime of Genocide*.⁶ It is important to mention that Lemkin was one of the most important participants at the *Convention*. Therefore, Lemkin's ideas were decisive in paving the way for the future genocide scholarship. His ideas were critically presented by Dominck J. Schaller and Jurgen Zimmerer (2009) in edited work entitled *The Origins of Genocide: Raphael Lemkin as a Historian of Mass Violence* and by John Cooper (2008) *Raphael Lamkin and the Struggle for the Genocide Convention*.⁷ In 1948 the United Nations adopted its *Convention on Genocide*, whereby its definition includes various harmful acts "committed intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnic, religious group, as such."⁸ According to Article 1 of the *Convention*, the genocide, "whether it was committed in peace or in war, under international law, constitutes a crime by which they undertake to prevent and punish," while, according to the definition of Article 2, genocide constitutes a genocide when: "Each of the following acts committed in the intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnic, racial or religious group, as such a) killing members of the group; b) causing serious bodily or psychological harm to members of the group; c) the deliberate imposition on the group of living conditions for which it is intended to lead to its complete or partial physical destruction; d) the introduction of measures aimed at preventing the occurrence of progeny in that group; e) deliberately transferring children from that group to another group." According to Article 3 the following acts shall be punishable: (a) Genocide; (b) Conspiracy to commit genocide; (c) Direct and public incitement to commit genocide; (d) Attempt to commit genocide; (e) Complicity in genocide.⁹

The *Convention on the Prevention of the Crime of Genocide* emerged as a result of the completion of the World War II and foreseeing and gradual emergence of the Cold War. The *Convention* and the "Model" was very much useful for judging and sentencing the destruction and extermination of the Jews by the Nazis. Courthoys and Docker (2011)

⁶ *Convention on the Prevention of the Crime of Genocide*. 1948. Retrieved from https://www.oas.org/dil/1948_Convention_on_the_Prevention_and_Punishment_of_the_Crime_of_Genocide.pdf

⁷ See Dominck J. Schaller and Jurgen Zimmerer, (Ed.), *The Origins of Genocide: Raphael Lemkin as a Historian of Mass Violence*, S.I.: Routledge, 2013 and John Cooper, *Raphael Lamkin and the Struggle for the Genocide Convention*, Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.

⁸ Kuper Leo. *Genocide*. New York: Penguin, 1981, p. 210.

⁹ Ann Curthoys and John Docker, "Defining Genocide." (pp. 9-41). In Stone Dan (Ed.) *The Historiography of Genocide*, New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2011, pp. 13-14.

rightly posed several pondering questions, for which answers could be hardly deduced from this document. For instance “Are there forms of genocide which do not involve mass killing? What are the criteria for assessing intention in genocidal events and processes? Do genocides necessarily involve state action or leadership? Should mass killing based on political categories be called genocide? What is meant by cultural genocide? And finally, to what extent must our definition of genocide for the purposes of historical scholarship conform to the definition used in international law?”¹⁰ Therefore, in the following decades, especially after Srebrenica Genocide, the “Model” as such started to be questioned because of difficulties of identifying key perpetrators among politicians, military officers, artists, scholars, journalists and unaffiliated individuals. The *Convention* and the “Model” were effectively used because perpetrators and actors in committing the Holocaust were mostly political leaders and military officers. However, in comparison to the earliest applications of the *Convention* and the “Model” it was difficult to determine genocide goals, plans and motives in Srebrenica Genocide. Therefore, the meaning of the term “genocide” started to be open and it was subjected to different interpretations. The term genocide did not only include perpetuated, planned and systematic destruction of a specific group of people but also the ethnic cleansing and the destruction of physical, cultural, urban, humanitarian, social and economic forms of living. Such conditions had strengthened genocide against Bosniaks because renewal of the life was made impossible. For instance, “the Tribunal considered the relevance to the Srebrenica Muslim community of the destruction of approximately 7,000 men. It referred to an observation of the Trial Chamber about the patriarchal character of Bosnian Muslim society in Srebrenica, and the consequent impact upon the future of the community that would result from the killing of its adult male population.”¹¹ According to Hayden (2011) “less than 1 per cent of the victims were women and 89.9 per cent men between the ages of 16 and 60.”¹² Therefore, new ethnic reality was forged by Srebrenica Genocide because today Srebrenica is predominantly a Serb town.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 9.

¹¹ William A. Schabas, “The Law and Genocide.” (pp. 123-142). In Bloxham Donald and Moses A. Dirk (Eds.). *The Oxford Handbook of Genocide Studies*. Oxford: University Press, 2010, p. 137.

¹² Robert M. Hayden, “Mass Killings and Images of Genocide in Bosnia 1941-5 and 1992-5.” (487-517). In Stone Dan (Ed.). *The Historiography of Genocide*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2011, pp. 502-503.

Very initiation of genocide, its planning and realization depended significantly on the ideology. In this regard, nothing much has changed from the World War II, whereby Nazis committed the Holocaust because of Nazism and Serbs committed Srebrenica Genocide because of Serb nationalist hegemonic radical ideology. Therefore, it is very important that Srebrenica Genocide was primarily motivated by the Serb nationalist hegemonic radical ideology, not exclusively by Orthodox Christianity or the religious motives. Thus, in Bosnia and Herzegovina there was certainly no conflict between the Orthodox Christianity and the religion of Islam. The mosques and religious monuments were not destroyed because of their religious character but because they are the part of the Bosniak national identity and as such were targeted. Unfortunately, the Serb population was directed by the intellectuals, politicians and key leaders to move away from acceptable national identity and patriotism to radical, extreme, hegemonic, exclusive ethno-cultural nationalism. For instance, key Serbian document called the *Memorandum of the Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts* (SANU Memorandum 1986) clearly indicated that

army, would react so violently to Slovenian, Croatian and Bosnian declarations of independence, for their ethno-centric ideology does not acknowledge the right of other nations to exist on a political nor even social or cultural level if they conflict with Greater Serbian aspirations. They veil their true intentions with the assertion that they are 'protecting the territorial integrity of Yugoslavia,' but the wanton destruction and the 'ethnic cleansing' practiced by Serbian militias (including the so-called 'Yugoslav' army) proves that they are waging a war of conquest and aggression inspired by an ideology of intolerance.¹³

Such radical ethno-cultural national ideology was systematically used for the creation of Greater Serbia, which was supposed eventually to be cleansed from the “other” “alien” ethnicities, nations and people. For the sake of the creation of Greater Serbia, the Serbian leadership and its key associates were not hesitating to terrorize, cleanse, expel, kill and liquidate the members of other social groups. It is important to mention that “the media in parts of the former Yugoslavia played a crucial part in the attack against Croatia, the genocidal war in Bosnia and the atrocities in Kosovo, abetting the so-called “joint criminal enterprise” that was led by Milosevic. They

¹³ Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts (SANU), *Memorandum*, Belgrade, 1986, n.p.,

mobilized nationalist myths, created cults of military commanders, and demonised and denigrated other national groups, though very rarely with the extreme means that we saw guiding Nazi propaganda.¹⁴ Therefore, Frank Chalk and Kurt Jonassohn (1990) introduced an historical-sociological approach to genocide. Perhaps, being influenced by Hobbes they identified four types of genocide: to eliminate threats, to implement an ideology, to acquire wealth and for revenge.¹⁵ These motives revolve around key etymological concepts such as gain, glory, fear, revenge, ideology, power and terror.

History and Sociology of Srebrenica Genocide

One of the strategic goals of the Serbian national ideology was the control of Eastern parts of Bosnia and Herzegovina, alongside the Drina River. The Serbs had the strategic goal during the war (1992-1995) and in peacetime until today to keep this geopolitical region mono-ethnic, exclusively populated by the Serbs. Before the war in Bosnia and Herzegovina due to significant demographic concentration of Bosniaks this was the territory of separation between the Serbs in Serbia and the Serbs in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Thus, in order to link Serbian population on both sides of the Drina River, as to fulfill an ideological dream of “all Serbs in one country,” the Serbs made the ethnic cleansing of Bosniaks and Srebrenica Genocide. For the sake of fulfilling this historical objective “The ethnic- cleansing campaigns carried out by the Bosnian Serb Army and their associated militias (backed by Belgrade) involved some 3,600 towns and villages in Bosnia- Herzegovina and hundreds of thousands of Bosnian Muslims. The fundamental idea was to drive the Muslims— men, women, and children— from their homes in territory that the Serbs claimed as their own.”¹⁶

In 1993 the Security Council passed Resolution 819, which declared Srebrenica as “safe-guarded zone,” however this didn’t prevent the Serbs to start a military operation against the “safe zone” of Srebrenica by the beginning of July, 1995. Prior to this operation the situation in besieged zone was disastrous and civilians were dying of

¹⁴ Mark Thompson, “Incitement, Prevention and Media Right.” (pp. 97-107) In Idem., (Eds). *Confronting Genocide*. New York and London: Springer, 2011, p. 99.

¹⁵ See Frank Chalk and Kurt Jonassohn, *The History and Sociology of Genocide*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990.

¹⁶ Norman M. Naimark, *Genocide: A World History*. Oxford: University Press, 2017, pp. 126-127.

starvation. The military operation was directly supported by the Serbian paramilitary forces and volunteers from Greece and Russia. According to Weiss-Wendt (2010) “out of 10,000 Serb volunteers who fought in Bosnia, half had previously served in the Yugoslav People’s Army. Unsurprisingly, then, the military controlled most of the militias, with the rest run by the State Security Service.”¹⁷ Jones (2006) argued that paramilitary forces were used purposefully as to enable the Serbian government to deflect responsibility for invading Bosnia and Herzegovina and for committing crimes against humanity and genocide.¹⁸

Earlier Srebrenica was demilitarized and was made the “safe zone” of the United Nations under UNPROFOR’s direct control and protection. However, the UN protection didn’t prevent the Serb military forces to enter Srebrenica on July 11 and to liquidate in and around the “safe zone” more than 8000 Bosniaks. In less than a week, more than 8000 civilians were liquidated and buried in mass graves, civilians were beaten and humiliated publically, children were killed in front of their parents and young girls were raped.¹⁹ The Serb militia systematically plunged thousands of dead bodies into mass graves. Srebrenica Genocide also had the final implication of forced displacement of around 30,000 people, mostly women and children. During the days of displacement the Serb militia was frequently stopping buses and trucks to brutally harass the women and children, take from them money and jewelry and they were selectively taking young boys and girls away from their mothers. Their bodies were later found in the mass graves.²⁰ They were not only liquidated and displaced because of their ethnic, religious, linguistic and cultural origins but because of a master plan to cleanse the territory, to exterminate Bosniaks form Eastern Bosnia and to create a homogeneous exclusively Serbian territory. Serb *modus operandi* was systematic as it started with surrounding the area to be cleansed and

¹⁷ Anton Weiss-Wendt, “The State and Genocide.” (pp. 81-102). In Bloxham Donald and Moses A. Dirk (Eds.). *The Oxford Handbook of Genocide Studies*. Oxford: University Press, 2010, p. 95.

¹⁸ Jones Adam. *The Genocidal Mind: Sociological and Sexual Perspectives*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 2006, p. 107.

¹⁹ Elisa von Joeden-Forgey, “Gender and Genocide.” (pp. 61-81). In Bloxham Donald and Moses A. Dirk (Eds.). *The Oxford Handbook of Genocide Studies*. Oxford: University Press, 2010, p. 69.

²⁰ See Campbell J. Kenneth. *Genocide and the Global Village*. New York: Palgrave, 2010, pp. 55-70 and Norman M. Naimark, *Genocide: A World History*. Oxford: University Press, 2017, p. 129.

the creation of large concentration camp. Then, the operation paved the way for the killing of key political leaders, military officers, lawyers, judges, public officials, writers and professors. The plan was carried, furthermore, towards the separation of women, children and old men from men of so-called "fighting age." The last stage of the operation was carried out through systematic executions, liquidations and the disposal of bodies in the mass graves.²¹

Therefore, a long-term designed plan for genocide and ethnic cleansing clearly indicated that this was a conscious, deliberate and well-planned aim to radically change the demographic map, which is today in Bosnia and Herzegovina very much visible as very small percentage of Bosniaks are living in this region. It is important to add that besides the ethnic cleansing and genocide, Serb political leaders and their military executors ensured also the destruction of cultural heritage, whereby many important historical, religious and cultural monuments were destroyed. Therefore, Srebrenica Genocide is significantly reflected in sociocide, culturicide, urbicide and memoricide.

The international community and the United Nations failed to support and protect the civilians in the "safe zone" for which they bear full responsibility as they did not prevent the crime of genocide. The United Nations acted contrary to the Charter on the *Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide* (1948), the *Geneva Conventions* (1949) and *Additional Protocols* (1977). The United Nations and UNPROFOR mandate in the "safe zone" was significantly reduced, especially the use of air forces, prior to the Serb military operation. Thus, UNPROFOR left the civilian population on its own and set its ultimate goal to protect its personnel and to enable the continuation of so-called peace negotiations. In this regard, some critics argue that Srebrenica as a "safe zone" was sacrificed because of the peace-talks. Otherwise it is difficult to believe that the world had no political and military capability to prevent Srebrenica Genocide. Why the United Nations did not request the decisive air power use in the defense of Srebrenica civilians? Why was a genocide committed against the Bosniaks in the presence of the Dutch Battalion? Why did the Dutch Battalion withdraw from the key check points and hand them over to the Serb militia? Therefore, Provost and Akhavan (2013)

²¹ See Adam Jones, *The Genocidal Mind: Sociological and Sexual Perspectives*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 2006, 216.

are right in arguing that the “Dutch UN peacekeepers could have protected the Bosnian Muslim population of the Srebrenica “safe-area” against mass murder. Such was the political fallout of this revelation that it prompted the resignation of the Dutch cabinet in 2002. In all of these situations, intervention was possible, and opportunities were missed.”²²

Srebrenica Genocide has shown that the acts of genocide were based on a systematic planning and as such were justified by Serbian political establishment. Therefore, “in 2007, in a case filed by Bosnia and Herzegovina against Serbia, the International Court of Justice said there had been a breach of the Genocide Convention because Serbia failed to intervene with its allies, the Bosnian Serbs, so as to prevent the Srebrenica massacre of July 1995.”²³ The Hague sentences, including for Srebrenica Genocide, unambiguously confirm genocidal intent, planning, preparation, organization and systematic execution of civilians, which was declared according to the international law as genocide and crimes against humanity. Thus, such crimes were perpetuated and planned, which left very little space for taking up responsibility and feeling of guilt. It is not strange to find that genocide denial is strong among those who directly committed it and among the common people from whom those actors of genocide came from.

Both, the Hague legal sentences and the scientific studies on Srebrenica Genocide undoubtedly confirm that Serbian national ideology, politics and policies contributed towards genocide, which was well-planned, perpetuated, systematic and organized. Serbia planned to use the historical opportunity to take over the parts of a sovereign state of Bosnia and Herzegovina and to exterminate Bosniaks as the majority population of the country. Actually when the war started “the Bosnian Serbs and the Croats armed themselves for a struggle to unite “their” respective population centers in Bosnia with their “homelands.”²⁴ Thus, genocide was the tool to completely destroy one sovereign state and exterminate Bosniaks as a majority.

²² Provost Akhayan and Provost Rene, “Moving from Repression to Prevention of Genocide.” (pp. 1-13). In Idem., (Eds). *Confronting Genocide*. New York and London: Springer, 2011, p. 3.

²³ William A. Schabas, “The Law and Genocide.” (pp. 123-142). In Bloxham Donald and Moses A. Dirk (Eds.). *The Oxford Handbook of Genocide Studies*. Oxford: University Press, 2010, p. 129.

²⁴ Norman M. Naimark, *Genocide: A World History*. Oxford: University Press, 2017, p. 126.

Unfortunately, the same Serbian nationalist ideology stands behind the denial of Srebrenica Genocide. Same political establishment has till now escaped to admit Srebrenica Genocide; instead key Serbian politicians consider it as a terrible crime in which both Serbs and Bosniaks paid the price. Thus the human, state and moral responsibility of Serbia to make an apology to the Bosniak people and victims failed, as the Serbian Parliament failed to adopt the Resolution on Srebrenica Genocide. There are but few political leaders among the Serbs who admitted that the Serb Republic as entity in Bosnia and Herzegovina was created on genocide. Certainly, a systematic and intentional denial and negation are dangers for the repetition of genocide.

It is important to start with the question of how and why sociologists could not predict the disintegration of former Yugoslavian socialist society in terribly violent ways. What went wrong? Why did so-called modern and sophisticated Yugoslavian society commit crimes which culminated in Srebrenica Genocide? Such violent social transformation had not taken place in any other socialist state in transition in the Eastern Europe.²⁵ This shed doubt on the relevance and scientific approach of sociology in previous decades, as the logic and the scientific methodology of sociology were defeated in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Perhaps, this was the reason why Doubt (2000) wrote a book *Sociology after Bosnia and Kosovo*.²⁶ Since the genocide is itself a systematic, generic concept and planned targeting of a group of people with an aim of their extermination, while its perpetrators are rational, systematic and highly organized. These qualities are characteristics of highly developed states and societies, perhaps like that of former Yugoslavia. Therefore, we can talk about the "modernity" of a genocide or modern engineering project of genocide as Zygmundt Bauman in his works argued.²⁷ It has been proven without doubt that in "Bosnia, Serbian nationalists destroyed Bosniak and Croatian society while slaughtering only a minority, through intimidation, expulsion, torture, rape, and killing in improvised concentration camps. In contemporary destructions of

²⁵ See Abid Dozic, "Sociologija i bosanskohercegovački intelektualci nakon genocida u Srebrenici" [Sociology and Bosnian Intellectuals after Srebrenica Genocide]. *Znakovi Vremena*, 2005, Vol. 8. No. 29/30. pp. 114-131.

²⁶ See Keith Doubt, *Sociology after Bosnia and Kosovo: Recovering Justice*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Press, 2000.

²⁷ Michael Freeman, "Genocide, Civilization and Modernity." *The British Journal of Sociology*, 1995, Vol. 46. No. 2. pp. 207-223.

indigenous peoples, the methods and organization have been much more basic than the Final Solution's. Not surprisingly, a student of these genocides has argued that Bauman's 'thesis linking genocide to a specific level of state formation, technological efficiency, rationality, and subjectivity is belied' by other examples."²⁸ Puzzling question, posed by Bauman (2000), is how and why modern rational, scientific, technological, democratic, cultural and civilizational society could commit the genocide? How to put together and make the relationship between so-called civilizing process and extreme violent and evil behavior?²⁹

More than twenty years after the war, there is no societal consensus on the war, justice and the future of Bosnia and Herzegovina, thus, unresolved past is still hunting present-day Bosnian society. After the Dayton Peace Agreement (DPA) the first elections made no restrictions on the nationalist parties that participated in the war, therefore, the conflict had continued by the political means. The Dayton Peace Agreement gave preferences to ethno-nationalist division of power with regards to political, economic, ethnic, territorial and other divisions of the state and the society. Therefore, there was an articulation of mono-ethnic interests, which gave no chance to the reconciliation, peace and the common future.³⁰ Hopes for transitional justice in Bosnia and Herzegovina, as inevitable process of the peace-building, have been seen as an international "experiment" that will not bring any justice to any of the conflicting parties during the war. Hopes and expectations from the International Crime Tribunal for former Yugoslavia (ICTY) as a result of long trials, lack of transparency, questionable and low sentences for the surviving genocide perpetrators are lost and there is apathy with regards to an institutional delivery of justice. Even serious attempts of the International Community to articulate justice, peace and reconciliation have been tremendously questioned because of reemergence of nationalist political parties that are negating genocide and threatening the secession from Bosnia and Herzegovina.

²⁸ Martin Shaw, "Sociology and Genocide." (pp. 142-163). In Bloxham Donald and Moses A. Dirk (Eds.). *The Oxford Handbook of Genocide Studies*. Oxford: University Press, 2010, p. 153.

²⁹ See Zygmundt Bauman, *Modernity and the Holocaust*. New York: Cornell University Press, 2000.

³⁰ Muhidin Mulalic & Hasan Korkut. "Implications of Dayton Peace Agreement on Current Political Issues in Bosnia-Herzegovina," *SDU Faculty of Arts and Sciences Journal of Social Sciences Special Issue on Balkans*, 2012, Vol. 27, pp. 107-117.

Since, genocide had taken place in Bosnia and Herzegovina sociologists and social psychologists and therapists began exploring these subjects. The term genocide from the very beginnings had a strong sociological, legal and linguistics focus.³¹ Some of the most important works that had integrated sociological dimension of genocide were written by Helen Fein, *Genocide: A Sociological Perspective*. The question of the destruction of the state identity has become very popular subject among sociologists in Bosnia and Herzegovina. It is interesting that for some Bosnia and Herzegovina is not their country but the constituency of three ethnicities within one state. Bosnian state is only represented through state symbols such as passport, flag, and state institutions; however there is no affection and feelings about belonging to the state by significant strata of the Bosnian society. This implies that Bosnia and Herzegovina and its society have been encountering a significant sociological crisis.³²

Terms justice, law and peace are closely interconnected and interrelated and they are often used by Bosniaks in articulating the genocide and impossibility of the future without justice and peace. Most of the Bosniaks believe in common future with Serbs and Croats in Bosnia and Herzegovina and with Serbia and Croatia as good neighbors only if justice determined by the law is accepted by all sides. However, Bosnian society has been struggling to achieve post-war justice, truth and peace. In Bosnia and Herzegovina there are three dimensions of the truth. On the contrary, political leaders do not acknowledge crimes committed by their people against others during the war. These dilemmas prevent Bosnia to build its future on social consensus and understanding. Due to complexity of these concepts and their political implications sociologists have not explored them to deserved extent.

Demography of Ethnic Cleansing and Genocide

Genocide and ethnic cleansing in Bosnia and Herzegovina, especially in the Eastern parts were well-planned and systematic acts of the Serb leadership. An old idea of ethnic hatred among the main Balkans ethnic groups, based on the notion of 'balkanization' was not the main reason for ethnic cleansing and genocide but they were

³¹ See Adam Jones, *The Genocidal Mind: Sociological and Sexual Perspectives*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 2006.

³² Kemal Velagic, *Mladi Bosne i Hercegovine i sistem vrijednosti*. PhD. Dissertation, University of Sarajevo, 2010, pp. 26-27.

products of Serbian radical hegemonic ideology that began to be spread during the 1990s. In this regard, Serbian political elites, intellectuals and clergy played the significant role in creating Serbian ideological project and carrying out of the ethnic cleansing and genocide.³³ Ethnic cleansing across Bosnia and Herzegovina was carried out by the Serb political and military establishment against the Bosniak communities that were sharing the same territory. Thus, the ethnic cleansing included systematic, planned and deliberate political, administrative and military acts against the Bosniak community.

Ethnic cleansing as a political objective was officially adopted by the Serbs at their self-proclaimed *16th Assembly of the Serb People* that was organized on May 12, 1992 in Banja Luka. In this regard it is worth mentioning the adoption of the *Six Strategic Goals of the Serbian People* document. According to this document the main objective was the separation of the Serb majority population from the Bosniaks and Croats. The *Six Strategic Goals of the Serbian People* included the following six objectives: 1) establishment of state borders as to separate the Serbian people from the other two ethnic communities; 2) setting up a corridor between Semberija and Krajina; 3) establishment of a corridor in the Drina River valley, that is, eliminate the Drina as a border separating Serbian States; 4) establishment of a border on the Una and Neretva Rivers; 5) divide the city of Sarajevo into Serbian and Muslim parts and establish effective state authorities in both parts; and 6) ensure access to the sea for Republika Srpska.³⁴ Therefore, as a result of ethnic cleansing, genocide and war entity called Republika Srpska was accepted as one of three administrative units within Bosnia and Herzegovina as a result of Dayton Peace Agreement in 1995.³⁵ The mass exodus and expulsions of non-Serbs took place in different cities which resulted in significant demographic changes in present-day entity Republika Srpska (See Table 5, 6, and 7).

Table 1: The Population of Bosnia and Herzegovina (1948-2013)

Year of Census	Population
----------------	------------

³³ See Norman Cigar, *Genocide in Bosnia: The Policy of 'Ethnic Cleansing'* Texas A&M: University Press, 1995; Norman M. Naimark, *Genocide: A World History*. Oxford: University Press, 2017; Michael Mann, *The Dark Side of Democracy: Explaining Ethnic Cleansing*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

³⁴ Hikmet Karcic, "Detention Camps as a Tool for Ethno-Religious Cleansing of Non-Serbs in Bosnia and Herzegovina" (PhD Dissertation, International University of Sarajevo, 2018), 39.

³⁵ Mirko Pejanovic, "Promjene etnicke structure opstina u Bosni i Hercegovini prema popisu stanovništva 2013. Godine." In Cvitkovic Ivan (Ed.). *Demografske i Etnicke promjene u Bosni i Hercegovini*. Sarajevo: ANUBiH, 2017, 79-80.

1948	2.564.308
1953	2.847.459
1961	3.277.948
1971	3.746.111
1981	4.124.256
1991	4.377.033
2013	3.531.159

Source: Agency for Statistics of Bosnia and Herzegovina,
<http://www.popis2013.ba/>

Table 2: The Population of Ethnic Groups in BiH (2013 Census)

Ethnic Groups	Population	Percentage
Bosniaks	1.769.592	50,11 %
Serbs	1.086.733	30,77 %
Croats	544.780	15,42 %

Source: Agency for Statistics of Bosnia and Herzegovina,
<http://www.popis2013.ba/>

According to Table 1 and 2, the population of Bosnia and Herzegovina in 2013 was 3.531.159 people (Entity Republika Srpska 1.228.423 and Entity Federacija BiH 2.219.220) which is lower in comparison to the census of 1991 for 845 874 people, which is overall a decrease of about 19.3 %. Thus, in comparison to all censuses in the previous decades, the census of 2013 for the first time clearly indicated the population decline. As a matter of fact, the population of Bosnia and Herzegovina is similar to that of the population in 1961. Among other justified reasons, one of the major reasons for population decline was the war (1992-1995), during which 95940 people were killed, about two million internally and externally displaced and 1.2 million people forcedly migrated abroad.³⁶

Table 3: The Population of Ethnic Groups in FBiH and RS (2013 Census)

Ethnic Groups	FBiH	RS
Bosniaks	1.562.372 (70,40%)	171.839 (13,98%)
Serbs	56.550 (2,55%)	1,001.299 (81,51%)
Croats	497.883	29.645

³⁶ Ibid., 70-74

	(22,44%)	(2,41%)
--	----------	---------

Source: Agency for Statistics of Bosnia and Herzegovina,
<http://www.popis2013.ba/>

Table 3 also clearly indicated significant mono-ethnic demographic concentration of population in entity Republika Srpska and Entity Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina is mono-ethnic with Bosniaks 70.40%, Croats 22.44% and Serbs only 2.55%. On the other hand, entity Republika Srpska is also mono-ethnic with Serbs 81.51%, Bosniaks 13.98% and Croats only 2.41%.

Table 4: Bosniak Population Increase (2013 Census)

Ethnic Groups Bosniaks	Town	Population Increase (with more than four thousand)
	Novi Grad Sarajevo	+ 62.182
	Ilidža	+ 28.783
	Tuzla	+ 18.105
	Novo Sarajevo	+ 14.286
	Zenica	+ 12.629
	Vogošća	+ 11.852
	Sanski Most	+10.208
	Živinice	+9.072
	Ilijaš	+7.606
	Hadžići	+ 6.728
	Tešanj	+5.520
	Srebrenik	+5423
Bugojno	+4.453	

Source: Agency for Statistics of Bosnia and Herzegovina,
<http://www.popis2013.ba/>

Table 5: Bosniak Population Decrease in RS (2013 Census)

	Town	Population Decrease (with more than four thousand)
	Zvornik	- 28.247
Doboj	- 25.842	

Ethnic Groups Bosniaks	Banja Luka	-20.907
	Prijedor	- 20.317
	Bosanska Krupa	- 19.526
	Foča	- 19.520
	Bijeljina	- 17.139
	Vlasenica	- 14.964
	Srebrenica	- 14.163
	Bratunac	- 13.732
	Višegrad	- 12.428
	Rogatica	- 12.092
	Lopare	- 10.619
	Gradiška	- 8.271
	Ugljevik	- 8.056
	Novi Grad	- 7.601
	Modriča	- 7.274
	Kotor-Varoš	- 5.856
	Teslić	- 5.618
Derвента	- 5.191	
Trebinje	- 4.576	

Source: Agency for Statistics of Bosnia and Herzegovina,
<http://www.popis2013.ba/>

Table 6. Bosniaks as Majority vs. Minority (1991 Census and 2013 Census)

Ethnic Groups Bosniaks	Town	Percentage 1991	Percentage 2013
	Zvornik	59,16%	33,76%
Bratunac	64,32%	38,38%	
Foča	50,98 %	6,98 %	
Vlasenica	55,53 %	32,75 %	
Rogatica	59,36 %	10,37 %	
Višegrad	63,09 %	9,59 %	
Srebrenica	75,50%	54,68%	

Source: Agency for Statistics of Bosnia and Herzegovina,
<http://www.popis2013.ba/>

Table 4, 5 and 6 clearly indicated that due to the ethnic cleansing, genocide and war demographic changes took place in present day entity Republika Srpska. It is also significant to mention that

significant decrease of Serb, Bosniak and Croat population in FBiH and RS took place because of the creation of new mono-ethnic municipalities on the border lines. According to the data in municipalities with Serb majority in present day Republika Srpska 312.560 Bosnjaks are less in comparison to the census of 1991.³⁷ According to Pejanovic (2017) 170,000 Bosniaks and 10,000 Croats returned back to their homes to the entity Republika Srpska after the war.³⁸ As according to Table 5 and 6 Bosniaks lost significant number of the population in Zvornik (-28.247), Doboj (-25.842), Banja Luka (-20.907), Prijedor (-20.317), Bosanska Krupa (-19.526), Foca (-19.520), Bijeljina (-17.139), Vlasenica (-14.964), Srebrenica (-14.163), Bratunac (-13.732), Visegrad (-12.428), Rogatica (-12.092). Table 6 clearly indicated that in 6 towns in present-day Republika Srpska Bosniaks were majority in 1991 while according to 2013 census they were reduced to minority due to ethnic cleansing, genocide and war.

Table 7. Multiethnic vs. Mono-Ethnic Cities in RS (1991 Census and 2013 Census)

City	Ethnicity	1991 Census	2013 Census
<i>Banja Luka</i>	Bosniaks	14,6%	4,2%
	Serbs	54,6%	89,6%
	Croats	14,8%	2,8%
	Yugoslavs	12,1%	NA
	Others	3,9%	3,5%
<i>Bosanska Gradiška</i>	Bosniaks	26,4%	14,7%
	Serbs	59,6%	80,9%
	Croats	5,7%	1,6%
	Yugoslavs	5,5%	NA
	Others	2,7%	2,8%
<i>Bosanski Brod</i>	Bosniaks	12%	9,1%
	Serbs	33,4%	69,1%
	Croats	41,0%	19,8%
	Yugoslavs	10,7%	NA
	Others	2,9%	2,1%
<i>Bosanski Šamac</i>	Bosniaks	6,8%	7,3%
	Serbs	41,3%	76,7%
	Croats	44,7%	14,0%
	Yugoslavs	5,3%	NA

³⁷ Ivan Cvitkovic, "Nacionalna i konfesionalna slika Bosne i Hercegovina." In Idem., (Ed.). *Demografske i Etnicke promjene u Bosni i Hercegovini*. Sarajevo: ANUBiH, 2017, 32.

³⁸ Pejanovic, "Promjene etnicke structure opstina u Bosni i Hercegovini prema popisu stanovništva 2013. Godine," 81.

	Others	1,9%	1,9%
<i>Dervoenta</i>	Bosniaks	12,5%	6,9%
	Serbs	40,6%	81,6%
	Croats	38,9%	9,4%
	Yugoslavs	5,9%	NA
	Others	2,1%	2,1%
<i>Modriča</i>	Bosniaks	29,1%	12%
	Serbs	35,2%	78,6%
	Croats	27,5%	6,5%
	Yugoslavs	5,2%	NA
	Others	2,9%	2,8%
<i>Mrkonjić Grad</i>	Bosniaks	11,9%	2,2%
	Serbs	76,9%	96,3%
	Croats	7,8%	1,0%
	Yugoslavs	2,2%	NA
	Others	1,2%	0,5%
<i>Prijedor</i>	Bosniaks	43,9%	32,5%
	Serbs	42,3%	62,5%
	Croats	5,6%	2%
	Yugoslavs	5,7%	NA
	Others	2,5%	3,0%
<i>Prnjavor</i>	Bosniaks	15,2%	8,3%
	Serbs	71,2%	85,3%
	Croats	3,7%	1,3%
	Yugoslavs	3,7%	NA
	Others	6,2%	5,2%
<i>Skender Vakuf</i>	Bosniaks	5,5%	4,4%
	Serbs	68,3%	94,8%
	Croats	24,6%	0,3%
	Yugoslavs	0,9%	NA
	Others	0,7%	0,5%
<i>Teslić</i>	Bosniaks	21,4%	18,6%
	Serbs	55,1%	75,4%
	Croats	15,9%	3,7%
	Yugoslavs	5,8%	NA
	Others	1,8%	2,3%
<i>Trebinje</i>	Bosniaks	18,0%	3,4%
	Serbs	68,9%	93,5%
	Croats	4,0%	1,0%
	Yugoslavs	5,3%	NA
	Others	3,8%	2,1%

Source: Agency for Statistics of Bosnia and Herzegovina,
<http://www.popis2013.ba/>

Table 7 indicated multiethnic composition of cities in Republika Srpska while according to 2013 census multiethnic character of those cities was significantly changed. Pejanovic (2017) argued that according to 1991 census, 91 municipalities out of 109 had multiethnic and multicultural composition in Bosnia and Herzegovina. However, 46 municipalities had significant multiethnic and multicultural composition.³⁹ In this regard demographic changes were direct result of ethnic cleansing but such planned acts also included a systematic humiliation of Bosniaks and the destruction of their culture and heritage. Actually the term 'clean' in contrast to 'dirty' has cultural connotations because newly cleansed territory was supposed to be without any other ethnic 'dirt' or 'contamination'.⁴⁰

Conclusion

This paper analyzed the key terms, concepts and theories of genocide by putting in the perspective Srebrenica Genocide. A conceptual and theoretical analysis clearly pointed to the complexity of using and applying the term genocide. To prevent future acts of genocide it is important to tackle effectively genocide denial, based on established facts and court sentences. The punishments for those who committed genocide and justice for the victims is ultimate obligation of the International community, regional powers and state actors of Bosnia and Herzegovina. The society at large must be educated about genocide as to recognize crimes against humanity and suffering of genocide victims. Jones (2006) skillfully summarized common views of genocide deniers by arguing that their discourse often revolves around the following statements: "hardly anybody died;" "it was self-defense;" "the deaths were not intentional;" "there was not central direction;" "there were not that many people to begin with;" "it was not/ is not genocide because;" "we would never do that;" "we are the real victims."⁴¹

Srebrenica Genocide should be taken as a historical lesson not only in Bosnia and Herzegovina but in the whole world. Considering such lessons we must teach our children about the dangers of racism, anti-Semitism, Islamophobia and other examples of human

³⁹ Ibid., 74-79.

⁴⁰ See David Rieff, *Slaughterhouse: Bosnia and the Failure of the West*. New York: Vintage, 1995.

⁴¹ Jones Adam, *Genocide: A Comprehensive Introduction*. London and New York: Routledge, 2006, pp. 351-354.

intolerance. The young generations must be taught to value human rights, freedoms and liberties. On the other hand, they must be encouraged to reject hatred and intolerance so that Srebrenica never happens to any nation in the world. In Bosnia and Herzegovina, the prevention of future genocide does not only depend on a symbolic sympathy towards genocide victims. It is important to understand the cultural and psycho-social reasons for not only why people commit genocide against their neighbors but why people in peace deny genocide. The culture of remembering the victims of genocide is of existential significance and through the creation of the collective memory we strongly affirm universal values of justice. Therefore, the culture of remembering the victims of genocide is of existential significance. Through research, conferences, exhibitions, personal and collective stories we should explain what genocide is, why it takes place and what are the consequences of genocide.

Srebrenica Genocide had received significant international attention. Prominent diplomats, politicians, policy-makers, writers, journalists, artists and intellectuals have done a lot to create cultural and civilization awareness regarding Srebrenica Memory. There are numerous books, exhibitions, memorials, seminars, symposiums, conferences and Summer School courses that keep the memory of Srebrenica Genocide. Potocari Memorial Center, where all those who were killed in Srebrenica Genocide, an Annual Commemoration and the March of Peace keep genocide memories and teach present and future generations "never again." The government of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Srebrenica Mothers and different non-governmental organizations have been lobbying for the adoption of Srebrenica Genocide Declaration by the different countries and especially by the EU, the USA and the Balkan countries. Lately, the British Government made the proposal as to include Srebrenica Genocide into the history textbooks.

Bibliography

- Akhayan P. and Provost Rene. 2011. "Moving from Repression to Prevention of Genocide." (pp. 1-13). In Idem., (Eds). *Confronting Genocide*. New York and London: Springer.
- Access to Justice: Facing the Past and Building Confidence for the Future*. 2012.
http://www.undp.org/content/dam/bosnia_and_herzegovina/docs/Research&Publications/Crises%20Prevention%20and%20Recovery/Facing%20the%20Past%20and%20Access%20to%20Justice/BIH_facing_the_past_and_access_to_justice.pdf
- Agencija za statistiku (2016) *Popis stanovništva, domaćinstava i stanova u BiH, 2013*, Rezultati popisa, Agencija za statistiku, Sarajevo. Available at <http://www.popis2013.ba/>
- Bauman, Z. 2000. *Modernity and the Holocaust*. New York: Cornell University Press
- Campbell J. Kenneth. 2001. *Genocide and the Global Village*. New York: Palgrave.
- Carmichael Cathie. 2010. "Genocide and Population Displacement in Post-Communist Eastern Europe." (pp. 509-529). In Bloxham Donald and Moses A. Dirk (Eds.). *The Oxford Handbook of Genocide Studies*. Oxford: University Press.
- Cigar Norman. 1995. *Genocide in Bosnia: The Policy of 'Ethnic Cleansing'* Texas A&M: University Press.
- Chalk, F. and Jonassohn, K. 1990. *The History and Sociology of Genocide*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Convention on the Prevention of the Crime of Genocide*. 1948. Retrieved from
https://www.oas.org/dil/1948_Convention_on_the_Prevention_and_Punishment_of_the_Crime_of_Genocide.pdf
- Cooper John. 2008. *Raphael Lamkin and the Struggle for the Genocide Convention*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Cvitkovic Ivan. 2017. "Nacionalna i konfesionalna slika Bosne i Hercegovina." (pp. 27-48) In Idem., (Ed.). *Demografske i Etnicke promjene u Bosni i Hercegovini*. Sarajevo: ANUBiH
- Curthoys Ann and Docker John. 2011. "Defining Genocide." (pp. 9-41). In Stone Dan (Ed.). *The Historiography of Genocide*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Danner Mark. 1999. "Endgame in Kosovo." *New York Review of Books*.
- Doubt Keith. 2000. *Sociology after Bosnia and Kosovo: Recovering Justice*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Press.

- Dozic Abid. 2005. "Sociologija i bosanskohercegovački intelektualci nakon genocida u Srebrenici" [Sociology and Bosnian Intellectuals after Srebrenica Genocide]. *Znakovi Vremena*, Vol. 8. No. 29/30. pp. 114-131.
- Freeman Michael. 1995. "Genocide, Civilization and Modernity." *The British Journal of Sociology*. Vol. 46. No. 2. pp. 207-223.
- Joeden-Forgey von Elisa. 2010. "Gender and Genocide." (pp. 61-81). In Bloxham Donald and Moses A. Dirk (Eds.). *The Oxford Handbook of Genocide Studies*. Oxford: University Press.
- Jones Adam. 2006a. *The Genocidal Mind: Sociological and Sexual Perspectives*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Jones Adam. 2006b. *Genocide: A Comprehensive Introduction*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Kuper Leo. 1981. *Genocide*. New York: Penguin.
- Hayden M. Robert. 2011. "Mass Killings and Images of Genocide in Bosnia 1941-5 and 1992-5." (487-517). In Stone Dan (Ed.). *The Historiography of Genocide*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Kapetanovic Darel. 2016. *Između sjećanja, poricanja i zaborava – o kulturi sjećanja u BiH 20 godina nakon rata (Between Remembrance, Neglecting and Forgetfulness – About the Culture of Remembrance in BiH 20 Years after the War)*.
http://www.fes.ba/files/fes/pdf/publikationen/2015/KAPETA_NOVIC_1_12_2016.pdf
- Karcic Hikmet, "Detention Camps as a Tool for Ethno-Religious Cleansing of Non-Serbs in Bosnia and Herzegovina" PhD Dissertation, International University of Sarajevo, 2018.
- Lemkin, Rehael. 1944. *Axis Rule in Occupied Europe*. Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.
- Mann Michael. 2005. *The Dark Side of Democracy: Explaining Ethnic Cleansing*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Mulalic Muhidin & Korkut Hasan. 2012. "Implications of Dayton Peace Agreement on Current Political Issues in Bosnia-Herzegovina," *SDU Faculty of Arts and Sciences Journal of Social Sciences Special Issue on Balkans*, Vol. 27, pp. 107-117.
- Naimark M. Norman. 2017. *Genocide: A World History*. Oxford: University Press.
- Pejanovic Mirko. 2017. "Promjene etnicke structure opština u Bosni i Hercegovini prema popisu stanovništva 2013. Godine." (pp. 70-93) In Cvitkovic Ivan (Ed.). *Demografske i Etnicke promjene u Bosni i Hercegovini*. Sarajevo: ANUBiH

- Powell Christopher. 2007. "What Do Genocides Kill? A Relational Conception of Genocide." *Journal of Genocide Research*. Vol. 9. No. 4. (pp. 527-547).
- Rieff, David. 1995. *Slaughterhouse: Bosnia and the Failure of the West*. New York: Vintage.
- Schaller J. Dominick and Zimmerer Jurgen. 2009. *The Origins of Genocide: Raphael Lemkin as a Historian of Mass Violence*. New York: Routledge.
- Shaw Martin. 2010. "Sociology and Genocide." (pp. 142-163). In Bloxham Donald and Moses A. Dirk (Eds.). *The Oxford Handbook of Genocide Studies*. Oxford: University Press.
- Schabas A. William. 2010. "The Law and Genocide." (pp. 123-142). In Bloxham Donald and Moses A. Dirk (Eds.). *The Oxford Handbook of Genocide Studies*. Oxford: University Press.
- Stiglmayer, Alexandra. (Ed.). 1995. *Mass Rape: The War against Women in Bosnia-Herzegovina*. Lincoln, NB: University of Nebraska Press.
- Thompson Mark. 2011. "Incitement, Prevention and Media Right." (pp. 97-107) In Idem., (Eds). *Confronting Genocide*. New York and London: Springer.
- Velagic Kemal. 2010. *Mladi Bosne i Hercegovine i sistem vrijednosti*. PhD. Dissertation, University of Sarajevo.
- Weiss-Wendt Anton. 2010. "The State and Genocide." (pp. 81-102). In Bloxham Donald and Moses A. Dirk (Eds.). *The Oxford Handbook of Genocide Studies*. Oxford: University Press.