

Bekir Hodžić

Center for the Study of Genocide and Human Rights at Rutgers University
bhodzic@vassar.edu

Dr. Sarah Snyder

Center for the Study of Genocide and Human Rights at Rutgers University
Ss5769@scarletmail.rutgers.edu

UDC 37:341.485(497.6 Srebrenica)(73)"1995"

UDC 341.485(497.6 Srebrenica)(73)"1995"

Original scientific article

RECALLING SREBRENICA: FURTHERING EDUCATION ON THE GENOCIDE IN BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA WITHIN THE UNITED STATES

Abstract: Genocide education in the United States constitutes a complex landscape filled with institutional fragmentation, representational gaps, and pedagogical challenges. This study examines where the Genocide in Bosnia and Herzegovina fits within educational and curriculum development frameworks. To illuminate the systemic challenges that face attempts at teaching about Bosnia inside America, we conduct a multi-methodological analysis of state-level genocide education mandates, curriculum resources, and pedagogical approaches, and survey political, social, and economic factors that influence curriculum design, like the decentralized nature of the American education system, where state-level autonomy holds significant sway. Through this review, our study uncovers profound disparities in the recognition and representation of Srebrenica and the broader Genocide in Bosnia and Herzegovina in U.S. classrooms. Few states explicitly acknowledge the genocide in their educational requirements, and available curriculum materials remain substantially inadequate. Our investigation also crucially centers on curriculum development processes. It explores the complex pedagogical considerations essential to creating meaningful, sensitive, and thorough genocide education materials, alongside specific challenges and advantages that come with schooling on Bosnia. These considerations include testimony selection, student and parental sensitivity,

linguistic accessibility, emotional intelligence structures, and the strategic implementation of comparative genocide studies. Our findings underscore the urgent need for a more nuanced, trauma-informed, and comprehensive approach to genocide education. And by highlighting current limitations and proposing fresh strategic foundations for curriculum development, this research contributes to broader discussions about historical representation, educational equity, and the role of education in commemorating genocides and preventing future atrocities.

Keywords: Curriculum, United States Education, Pedagogy, Genocide Education, Trauma-informed, Genocide Prevention, Commemoration and Memorialization

PODSJEĆANJE NA SREBRENICU: UNAPREĐENJE OBRAZOVANJA O GENOCIDU U BOSNI I HERCEGOVINI U SJEDINJENIM AMERIČKIM DRŽAVAMA

Sažetak: Obrazovanje o genocidu u Sjedinjenim Američkim Državama predstavlja složen sistem obilježen institucionalnom fragmentacijom, nedostacima u predstavljanju i pedagoškim izazovima. Ovo istraživanje analizira kako se genocid koji se desio u Bosni i Hercegovini uklapa u obrazovne i kurikularne okvire u SAD-u. Kako bi se osvijetlili sistemski izazovi s kojima se suočavaju pokušaji poučavanja o Bosni u američkom obrazovnom kontekstu, sprovedena je višemetodološka analiza državnih propisa o obrazovanju o genocidu, nastavnih resursa i pedagoških pristupa, te su razmotreni politički, društveni i ekonomski faktori koji utječu na oblikovanje nastavnih planova i programa, a posebno decentralizovana priroda američkog obrazovnog sistema, u kojem autonomija saveznih država ima značajnu ulogu.

Ovim pregledom istraživanje otkriva duboke nejednakosti u prepoznavanju i predstavljanju Srebrenice i šireg genocida u Bosni i Hercegovini u američkim učionicama. Tek nekolicina saveznih država eksplicitno priznaje genocid u svojim obrazovnim zahtjevima, dok dostupni nastavni materijali ostaju u velikoj mjeri nedovoljni. Poseban fokus studije je i na procesu razvoja kurikuluma, pri čemu se istražuju složeni pedagoški aspekti nužni za stvaranje smislenih, osjetljivih i sveobuhvatnih nastavnih materijala o genocidu, kao i specifični izazovi i prednosti poučavanja o Bosni. Ti aspekti uključuju odabir svjedočenja, osjetljivost učenika i roditelja, jezičku

pristupačnost, strukture emocionalne inteligencije i strateško uvođenje komparativnih studija genocida.

Nalazi istraživanja ukazuju na urgentnu potrebu za dubljim, osjetljivijim i sveobuhvatnijim pristupom obrazovanju o genocidu koji uzima u obzir posljedice traume. Naglašavajući postojeća ograničenja i nudeći nove strateške temelje za razvoj kurikuluma, ovo istraživanje doprinosi široj raspravi o historijskom predstavljanju, obrazovnoj pravednosti i ulozi obrazovanja u komemoraciji genocida i prevenciji budućih zločina.

Ključne riječi: kurikulum, obrazovni sistem Sjedinjenih Američkih Država, pedagogija, obrazovanje o genocidu, trauma-informisani pristup, prevencija genocida, komemoracija i memorijalizacija.

Introduction

On May 16, 2023, the Connecticut General Assembly approved S.B. 1158, a bill that designated “July eleventh of each year [within the state] as Bosnian Genocide Remembrance Day”¹ so to “remember the more than eight thousand Bosniak civilians killed in Srebrenica during the Bosnian war.”² While other states have had governors issue proclamations or

¹ We note here that many English-language observers use the term “Bosnian Genocide” when referring to the Genocide in Bosnia and Herzegovina committed against Bosniak people in Bosnia and Herzegovina from 1992–1995. Of course, the direct translation of the former term in Bosnian is “Bosanski Genocid,” which can cause confusion as it seemingly asserts that Bosnians committed a genocide, rather than the more complicated realities underlying the event. Given the status of this issue as a bilingual publication, we thus aim to privilege the term “Genocide in Bosnia and Herzegovina” wherever possible in our article.

² Conn. Gen. Stat. § 10-29a(112), (2024). For reportage on the bill and its eventual passage, see N1 Sarajevo, “Connecticut declares July 11 as Remembrance Day of Genocide in Bosnia,” *N1*, May 17, 2023, <https://n1info.ba/english/news/connecticut-declares-july-11-as-remembrance-day-of-genocide-in-bosnia/>; “Senator Anwar Votes with Senate to Create Day in Honor of Victims of Bosnian Genocide,” *Connecticut Senate Democrats*, May 16, 2023, <https://www.senatedems.ct.gov/anwar-230516>; Chatwan Mongkol, “New Haven professor raising awareness of Bosnian genocide among CT students, teachers: ‘We’re facing a denial,’” *New Haven Register*, March 27, 2023, <https://www.nhregister.com/news/article/new-haven-professor-commemmerating-bosnian-genocide-17856249.php>.

legislatures implement resolutions with similar statements, Connecticut stands as one of, if not the, first to codify an official Bosnian Genocide Remembrance Day inside its General Statutes.³ Before the bill passed, the General Assembly held a public hearing which over a dozen Bosniak genocide survivors and descendants, alongside communal allies, provided testimony for. Testifiers consistently mentioned education — Mirzet Muminovic, stressed that through the law, “future generations of children in Connecticut could learn about a genocide that took place in the 20th century in heart of Europe”—and referred to Connecticut’s recently promulgated Holocaust and genocide education mandate—David Pettigrew highlighted how the bill would “supplement our educators’ efforts as they implement Public Act 18-24 to include Holocaust and genocide education and awareness as part of the [state] social studies curriculum.”⁴ Though S.B. 1158 symbolized commemoration for these individuals, it also embodied a proactive movement toward institutionalizing knowledge of Srebrenica, and the larger genocide in Bosnia, in their community’s schools.⁵

³ As an example, since this bill’s passage, the Bosniak community in Kentucky has successfully advocated for a Senate resolution implementing a similar remembrance day. Sarah Phipps, “Kentucky Senate passes resolution declaring July 11 Srebrenica Genocide Remembrance Day,” *WBKO News*, February 27, 2025, <https://www.wbko.com/2025/02/28/kentucky-senate-passes-resolution-declaring-july-11-srebrenica-genocide-remembrance-day/>.

⁴ *Connecticut Government Administration and Elections Committee Public Hearing, March 6, 2023*, Connecticut General Assembly 2023 Regular Session (2023) (statement of Mirzet Muminovic), <https://www.cga.ct.gov/2023/gaedata/TMY/2023SB-01158-R000306-Muminovic,%20Mirzet-Supports-TMY.PDF>; *Connecticut Government Administration and Elections Committee Public Hearing, March 6, 2023*, Connecticut General Assembly 2023 Regular Session (2023) (statement of David Pettigrew), <https://www.cga.ct.gov/2023/gaedata/TMY/2023SB-01158-R000306Pettigrew,%20David,%20Professor%20of%20Philosophy-Southern%20CT%20State%20University-Supports-TMY.PDF>.

⁵ While our paper does discuss Srebrenica specifically at times, it also takes the view of it as constituting one part of a wider Genocide in Bosnia and Herzegovina for analytical purposes. As we will explain later, this emerges from how U.S. genocide education typically approaches the Bosnian example, alongside the need to contextualize Srebrenica in this pedagogy as deriving from a larger genocidal event. We accordingly refer to both “Srebrenica” and the “Genocide in Bosnia and Herzegovina” when reviewing the educational frameworks at issue here.

This anecdote demonstrates a wider phenomenon found across the United States. Due to the nation's decentralized public education system—where states have discretion to design their curricula and school structures—and its continued interest in the Holocaust, genocide, and other human rights issues many states have enacted laws that require “Holocaust and genocide” education.⁶ Such statutes provide avenues not only toward inculcating an understanding of mass atrocities in youth, but also present opportunities for survivor communities to advocate for their collective experience's inclusion. After all, the public nature of America's legislative (and educative) institutions means that these groups can emphasize their cause's importance before lawmakers through lobbying, testimony, and protest, as Connecticut's example illustrates, and wield their localized political power to similar ends.⁷ And because many mandates list specific cases of genocide educators should teach yet leave requirements open-ended, communities can organize to make themselves available to instructors as resources and thus, bring an attractive communal connection into classes. Yet, a bill cannot directly list every genocide, and teachers do not possess unlimited instructional time; instead, they must tailor what atrocities they discuss to those they deem most pertinent by law or personal judgment, the materials they find to aid their teaching, and other factors. The atrocities that these educational mandates—plus related curricular standards and other state decrees—do explicitly mention therefore gain major significance.⁸ When educators

⁶ Jennifer DeBoer, “Centralization and Decentralization in American Education Policy,” *Peabody Journal of Education* 87, no. 4, Philadelphia: Taylor & Francis, 2012, 510-513.

⁷ James A. Thurber, Colton C. Campbell, and David A. Dulio, eds., *Congress and Diaspora Politics: The Influence of Ethnic and Foreign Lobbying* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2018); Yossi Shain, “Ethnic Diasporas and U.S. Foreign Policy,” *Political Science Quarterly* 109, no. 5, New York: Academy of Political Science, 1994, 811–841.

⁸ Anna M. Yonas and Stephanie van Hover, “Misleading Mandates: The Null Curriculum of Genocide Education,” *Journal of Social Studies Research* 48, no. 4 (Amsterdam: Elsevier, 2024): 243-260; Samuel Totten, “Addressing the ‘Null Curriculum’: Teaching about Genocides Other than the Holocaust,” *Social Education* 65, no. 5, Silver Spring: National Council for the Social Studies, 2001, 309-313.

look to teach about genocide, they form the most visible exemplars in a crowded field. Their visibility concurrently increases the chance of state-provided pedagogical resources on them existing, making these case studies even more attractive for the classroom.

With Srebrenica's 30th anniversary, assessing how the atrocity, and the Genocide in Bosnia and Herzegovina broadly, fits into the above scholastic landscape constitutes a deeply necessary task. The United States houses a large student population that would benefit from education on the event, and other genocides, with all the lessons about the dangers of polarization, bigotry, and political manipulation that come with it.⁹ On that note, America has a large Bosniak diaspora, which would provide easier paths to remembrance and better knowledge of its circumstances.¹⁰ The country, moreover, plays a vital role in Bosnia's continued stability, a fact that renders ensuring that future generations of American leaders understand where that position comes from, and the dark legacies it emerges from, an essential goal for those Bosnians who wish for U.S. help in maintaining peace, stemming genocide denial, and addressing additional national wants.¹¹

Our article surveys all Holocaust and genocide education mandates in the United States, alongside curricular guidelines, to see which do and do not include Bosnia and if Bosnia is included, in which ways they do so.¹² Unlike other scholarly works, it further investigates what

⁹ Louise B. Jennings, "Challenges and possibilities of Holocaust education and critical citizenship: An ethnographic study of a fifth-grade bilingual class revisited," *Prospects* 40, no. 1 (London: Springer Nature, March 2010): 35-36.

¹⁰ John R. B. Palmer, "Patterns of Settlement Following Forced Migration: The Case of Bosnians in the United States," *Grup de Recerca Interdisciplinari en Immigració Working Paper Series* no. 35, Barcelona: Universitat Pompeu Fabra, 2018, <https://repositori-api.upf.edu/api/core/bitstreams/2816062f-0fd0-4df5-b2ed-bb700fc5b5a5/content>.

¹¹ Ivo H. Daalder, *Getting to Dayton: The Making of America's Bosnia Policy*, Washington D.C.: Brookings Institution Press, 2000; Derek Chollet, *The Road to the Dayton Accords: A Study of American Statecraft*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005; Daniel S. Hamilton, "Fixing Dayton: A New Deal for Bosnia and Herzegovina," *Wilson Center*, November 24, 2020, <https://www.wilsoncenter.org/publication/fixing-dayton-new-deal-bosnia-and-herzegovina>.

¹² Prior literature has contemplated general educational strategies for teaching the Genocide in Bosnia and Herzegovina, but our study is unique in its focus on the

official resources, if any, do states proffer on the Genocide in Bosnia and Herzegovina to educators.¹³ Through that review, we show how Bosnia—whether on the level of Srebrenica or the nation wholesale—receives little attention from contemporary mandates and standards, and when it does, how problems like vagueness often mar its mention. We uncover a similar lack of state-sanctioned resources, and additional issues, including misleading, if not denialist, materials. But we also note the potential that the U.S. education system still offers for teaching about the Genocide in Bosnia and Herzegovina. To that end, we detail our work crafting comprehensive curriculum on the Genocide in Bosnia and Herzegovina in all its aspects with the Center for the Study of Genocide and Human Rights at Rutgers University and sharing it with American schools, focusing on how this project works within this mandate environment to tackle the gaps described here. We consider what approaches our curricula adopts to foster a nuanced, trauma-informed, and flexible framework for understanding the Genocide in Bosnia and Herzegovina. We end by contemplating the future Bosnia possesses within these mandates and standards, alongside general reflections on its context, purpose, and development.

American curricular landscape. For examples, see Hikmet Karčić, “Teaching About the Bosnian Genocide,” in *Teaching about Genocide: Insights and Advice from Secondary Teachers and Professors*, vol. 1, Samuel Totten, ed., Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 2018, p. 133-142; Lisa M. Adeli, “The Bosnian Genocide: Teaching Ideas and Resources,” in *Teaching about Genocide: Advice and Suggestions from Professors, High School Teachers, and Staff Developers*, vol. 3, Samuel Totten, ed., Lanham: Roman & Littlefield, 2020, p. 27-36.

¹³ Most literature on the topic of American Holocaust and genocide education confines itself to mandate or curricular standard analysis, regardless of the critical perspective it takes. See William L. Smith, “Do Holocaust education mandates work?” *Phi Delta Kappan* 106, no. 4, Arlington: PDK International, 2024, 42-47; Yonas and van Hover, “Misleading Mandates,” p. 243-244.

Mandates, standards, and resources: a Bosnian case study

Genocide education within American public schools entered into the public consciousness during the 1970s, as domestic media production around and pedagogical awareness of the Holocaust increased.¹⁴ Grassroots curriculum efforts arose throughout the nation, though scholars frequently point to Vineland, New Jersey, as the community where schoolteachers most evidently began incorporating the Holocaust into their instruction, often aimed at fostering moral development; this curriculum included discussion of other atrocities, like the Armenian Genocide, making it one of the earliest comparative genocide education efforts.¹⁵ With these localized movements growing, states—starting with North Carolina in 1981—started forming commissions dedicated to producing materials, running workshops, and engaging with government actors to spread Holocaust and genocide teaching inside their school systems.¹⁶ And in 1985, California passed the United States’ first Holocaust and genocide education mandate.¹⁷ That move presaged several similar promulgations from states with large Jewish populations, including New York and Florida across the next few years, yet this spread soon slowed to a near standstill.¹⁸ But mandates reemerged in the 2010s due to increased antisemitism, Holocaust denial, and violence against Jewish Americans, leading to the issuance of most of those currently in

¹⁴ Thomas D. Fallace, “The Origins of Holocaust Education in American Public Schools,” *Holocaust and Genocide Studies* 20, no. 1, Oxford: Oxford University Press, Spring 2006, 80-102.

¹⁵ Thomas D. Fallace, *The Emergence of Holocaust Education in American Schools*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008, p. 1-8.

¹⁶ Dan Freedman, “The Origins of Holocaust Education in American Public Schools,” *Moment*, January 24, 2022, <https://momentmag.com/the-state-of-holocaust-education-in-america/?srsltid=AfmBOopi-RsljwT0W2OSWsp-xMu6qMUMLQFdg4tgqjburZzJOhYbzsr4>.

¹⁷ Paul Warne Matthewson, “Mandatory Holocaust Education Legislation in the State of Illinois: A Historical Study,” PhD diss., (University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 2015, p. 57.

¹⁸ Matthewson, “Mandatory Holocaust Education Legislation in the State of Illinois,” p. 65-66.

effect today.¹⁹ Even now, states without mandates continue to consider embracing them, and states with them continue to debate how to improve them, whether through legislative revisions or wider implementation strategies. Indeed, by some counts, around 40 states presently possess some form of regulation, statute, or commission devoted to Holocaust and genocide education, a marked improvement from only a decade ago.²⁰

Prior scholarship on U.S. genocide education has thus, unsurprisingly, scrutinized state-level mandates, what they contain, and how educators implement them. Yet there exists no scholarly literature at the time of this piece's writing that solely addresses Bosnia's appearance within these mandates and their associated curricular standards—most works, if they mention Bosnia at all, do so within a wider analysis of other genocides within instructional promulgations.²¹ Indeed, one says the same for most other genocides, with the Holocaust foregrounding most of the available scholarship on genocide education.²² That makes filling that silence essential to understanding where the Genocide in Bosnia and Herzegovina stands within American schools today. To do just that, we conduct a Bosnia-centered analysis of all available American state mandates, curricular standards, and resource pages dedicated to genocide

¹⁹ Lindsey Stillman, "Mandates on Holocaust and Genocide Education in the United States," in *Teaching and Learning Through the Holocaust: Thinking about the Unthinkable*, edited by Anthony Pellegrino and Jeffrey Parker, Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 2022, p. 29-60.

²⁰ Alyssa Wiener Sandler, "Moving Toward Never Again: State of Holocaust Education in the United States," *American Jewish Committee*, August 2022, https://www.ajc.org/sites/default/files/pdf/2022-09/Moving-Towards-Never-Again_8.22.pdf; "US State Legislation Map," *Echoes and Reflections*, accessed April 13, 2025, from <https://echoesandreflections.org/interactive-map/>.

²¹ One of the few scholarly works in this field to mention Bosnia is Yonas and van Hover, "Misleading Mandates." Besides its recent publication date demonstrating how little prior material exists on Bosnia in this context, the work itself only focuses on Bosnia sporadically within a wider sampling of "other genocides," though it does helpfully discuss some issues with curricular standards around the event. Yonas and van Hover, "Misleading Mandates," p. 252.

²² For an example, see Zehavit Gross and E. Doyle Stevick, eds., *As the Witnesses Fall Silent: 21st Century Holocaust Education in Curriculum, Policy and Practice*, Cham: Springer, 2015.

education below, considering how many of these materials discuss the Genocide in Bosnia and Herzegovina and in what ways. And significant lacks and potentialities surface from that examination.

Starting off, about 28 American states currently mandate Holocaust and genocide education together—or one or the other—through legislative requirements, with educators across their public schools needing to dedicate a set amount of hours, days, or general curricular time to teaching the topic.²³ Another seven states either encourage such instruction, require educators to have access to genocide education materials, or maintain vague standards that one can read as either demanding it or making it optional.²⁴ These mandates almost uniformly pay little attention to Bosnia. While most directly mention the Holocaust at minimum, and many list other atrocities like the Armenian and Rwandan genocides, of those 28 that decree genocide education, only two—California and Illinois—list Bosnia as an example, because of recent amendments to their texts; said otherwise, no current U.S. mandate embraces Bosnia as part of its original text, despite how nearly all these promulgations came after the Genocide in Bosnia and Herzegovina’s, and Srebrenica’s, end.²⁵ Among the 7 states that sit in a mandatory limbo, just Virginia mentions Bosnia inside an educational manual it orders the state to provide to every educator there.²⁶ Some states also include language within their mandates that implicitly cover Bosnia. More specifically, Kentucky law states that “[e]very public middle and high school’s curriculum shall include instruction on ... cases of genocide ... that a court of competent jurisdiction, whether a court in

²³ Those states are: Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Oregon, Rhode Island, Texas, Wisconsin.

²⁴ Those states are: Nevada, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Utah, Virginia, Washington.

²⁵ Cal. Edu. Code. § 51221.1 (2024); Ill. Comp. Stat. § 5/27-20.3 (2005).

²⁶ Va. Code. c. 474 (2009). For the manual itself, see “Resources for Teaching the Holocaust and Other World Genocides,” *Virginia Department of Education*, 2021, <https://www.doe.virginia.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/40737/638086144075130000>.

the United States or the International Court of Justice, has determined to have been committed,” and Nebraska’s statute enforces “[e]ducation on the Holocaust and other acts of genocide as recognized by the Congress of the United States or the United Nations as of January 1, 2022.”²⁷ Since both the International Court of Justice and U.S. Congress have labeled Srebrenica as genocide, these provisions imply that both states necessitate classroom time devoted to the atrocity.²⁸ All said, taking the most generous view possible, of the 35 states implicated by this analysis, just 5 touch on Bosnia within their genocide education mandates in some way—14% of the available pool.²⁹

Yet mandates do not end with legislative text. States additionally issue curricular standards that cover topics that educators must teach students.³⁰ Those that prescribe Holocaust and genocide education thus often release standards that indicate what atrocities warrant coverage within the classroom, and even states that lack these requirements will implement standards that discuss them—from historical, political, and other angles—therefore subtly commanding some level of such instruction. On this front, five states, all of which have mandates that ignore Bosnia, host standards that subsume “the genocid[e] in Bosnia”

²⁷ Ky. Rev. Stat. § 156.160(1.a.3), (2018); Neb. Rev. Stat. § 79-760.01(2.a.ii), (2022).

²⁸ ICJ, Application of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (Bosnia and Herzegovina v. Serbia and Montenegro), Judgment, 2007, ICJ Report, p. 155-166, <https://www.icj-cij.org/sites/default/files/case-related/91/091-20070226-JUD-01-00-EN.pdf>; A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding the massacre at Srebrenica in July 1995, S. Res. 134, 109th Cong., 1st sess., June 22, 2005, <https://www.congress.gov/bill/109th-congress/senate-resolution/134>.

²⁹ Multiple states have also drafted mandates that included Bosnia, like Pennsylvania, only to drop the mention in later drafts, or are currently working to expand their mandates definition of genocide to include Bosnia. Given that none of these efforts have ended in official requirements, however, we have not included them in our discussion here. But they do point to Bosnia’s presence within legislative minds and an ongoing interest in bringing it into American genocide instruction.

³⁰ Rachel G. Ragland and Daniel Rosenstein, “Holocaust Education: Analysis of Curricula and Frameworks: A Case Study of Illinois,” *The Social Studies* 105, no. 4, Philadelphia: Taylor & Francis, 2014, 175-183.

as an example of one instructors should examine.³¹ Four others sustain guidelines that consider Bosnia but do so by including as part of wider education on genocide in the “Balkans” or the “former Yugoslavia,” or by referring to what occurred in the country as “ethnic cleansing” rather than genocide.³² Five more lack mention of Bosnia within any standards but offer support materials on genocide—whether through a commission or public website—that list it as a case to connect to contemplate when aiming to meet instructional rules.³³ And Oregon’s 2024 educational concepts incorporate one where students “[a]nalyze efforts among nation-states and in the international community’s efforts to hold perpetrators responsible for their involvement in the Holocaust and other acts of genocide,” with the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia (ICTY) logged as an exemplar.³⁴ So, once more adopting the broadest perspective possible, one can count 15 states as having standards pushing education on the Genocide in Bosnia and Herzegovina in some capacity out of about 39 that maintain standards linked to Holocaust and genocide instruction, or 38% of the total.

Now, as that last paragraph implies, states frequently create websites or pages that store resources on Holocaust and genocide education for interested educators. Because teachers often cite a deficiency of such materials on lesser-known atrocities as a key impediment to their ability to raise them within the classroom, understanding what these platforms

³¹ Colorado Department of Education, “GLE 2 EOj,” *Colorado Academic Standards: Social Studies*, November 2022, <https://www.cde.state.co.us/cosocialstudies/cas-ss-p12-2022>, p. 115. The other states are: Connecticut, Massachusetts, Michigan, Oklahoma.

³² For an example, see Oklahoma State Department of Education, “WH.5.7,” *Oklahoma Academic Standards: Social Studies*, February 28, 2019, <https://oklahoma.gov/content/dam/ok/en/osde/documents/services/standards-learning/social-studies/Oklahoma-Academic-Standards-for-Social-Studies.pdf>, p. 69. Those states are: Florida, Hawai’i, and Texas. Some sources, like Yonas and van Hover, count South Carolina as being in a similar position, but we were unable to locate those standards.

³³ Those states are: Arizona, Illinois, New Hampshire, Virginia, and Washington.

³⁴ Oregon Department of Education, “HS.WR.CP.19,” *2024 Oregon Social Science Standards*, June 7, 2024, <https://www.oregon.gov/ode/educator-resources/standards/socialsciences/Documents/Final2024SocialScienceStandardsACCESSIBLE.pdf>, p. 89.

now share poses another critical need in assessing the landscape Bosnia-centered pedagogy faces.³⁵ On that front, a similar absence emerges.³⁶ Most pages from these state sources either solely contemplate the Holocaust, carry links that go to sites where one might incidentally find information on Bosnia, or briefly include material on Bosnia without that fact outwardly noted.³⁷ But five states keep pages or page sections explicitly devoted to Genocide in Bosnia and Herzegovina resources, including Illinois.³⁸ Another three include materials not wholly focused on Bosnia but that do include it as a case study or example within a wider resource.³⁹ And the California Department of Education collaborates with a Holocaust and genocide education organization network that offers two lesson plans on Bosnia, meaning that both states that highlight the case in their mandates do follow through with available educational aids.⁴⁰

³⁵ Jacqueline Mendez, Rachel McCormick, Liah Watt, Beth Gamse, Joseph Taylor, and Elisabet Raquel García, “Genocide Education in Massachusetts Middle & High Schools: A Statewide Landscape Analysis & 2023-2024 School Year Grant Outcomes Report,” *Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education*, October 2024, <https://www.doe.mass.edu/research/reports/2024/10-genocide-education.pdf>, p. 19.

³⁶ We limited the resources covered here to those directly provided by a state agency website or state-sanctioned commission. While outside platforms provide additional materials on Bosnia, conducting any analysis of that material would broaden this chapter’s focus significantly. Thus, in keeping with our state-centric theme, and given that most educators would turn to state-proffered resources first in trying to teach about Bosnia, we keep ourselves to these governmental sources.

³⁷ For examples, see “Required Instruction of the Holocaust and Other Cases of Genocide,” *Kentucky Department of Education*, August 2, 2022, https://www.education.ky.gov/curriculum/conpro/socstud/Pages/req_inst_holocaust_genocide.aspx and “The NC Holocaust Education Act,” *North Carolina Department of Public Instruction*, September 10, 2024, <https://www.dpi.nc.gov/districts-schools/classroom-resources/academic-standards/standard-course-study/social-studies/nc-holocaust-education-act>.

³⁸ “Educational Resources,” *Illinois Holocaust & Genocide Commission*, accessed April 13, 2025, from <https://hgc.illinois.gov/educational-resources.html>. Those states are: Arizona, Colorado, Oklahoma, and Wisconsin.

³⁹ Those states are: Connecticut, Virginia, and Washington.

⁴⁰ The lesson plans in question are Hilary Levine and Tosha Tillotson, “Understanding the Complex Genocide in Bosnia and Herzegovina: A Contemporary Genocide,” *California Teachers Collaborative for Holocaust and Genocide Education*, accessed April 13, 2025, from <https://cateacherscollaborative.org/education->

From a statistical viewpoint, that means 9 of 35 states with mandates carry Bosnia-specific resources, or 26%.⁴¹ As for the supplies proffered, many webpages and resource banks link to outside materials or academic groups, rather than present curriculum on Bosnia made for the state to educators; indeed, as detailed earlier, California stands as an exception to this rule in sharing distinct lesson plans that conform to the state's social studies standards. And more problematically, some of the items linked on these pages may include denialist works.

Multiple conclusions surface from this examination. For one, few Holocaust and genocide education mandates in the United States introduce Bosnia, or Srebrenica, as a quintessential case of the latter, rendering it unattractive or unknown to educators looking to fill limited classroom time with atrocity pedagogy. While state standards generate an additional opening for teaching on the Genocide in Bosnia and Herzegovina, and do invite its consideration on a larger scale, they remain deficient, and worse still, ascribe to terminology like “ethnic cleansing” and “conflict” to describe Bosnia, isolating it from genocide discussions and peddling terminology often explicitly used to downplay the nature of the atrocities committed in the country.⁴² That many guidelines further refer to the country only in elucidating such acts in the

resource/understanding-the-complex-genocide-in-bosnia-and-herzegovina-a-contemporary-genocide-1-unit-2-lessons/, and Hilary Levine and Tosha Tillotson, “The Siege of Sarajevo,” *California Teachers Collaborative for Holocaust and Genocide Education*, accessed April 13, 2025, from <https://cateacherscollaborative.org/education-resource/the-siege-of-sarajevo/>.

⁴¹ This number does not include Kentucky and Nebraska, despite the interpretation of their mandate's described above, do not seem to have embraced what it means for Bosnia on a governmental level. Meanwhile, Virginia is also counted in this analysis. Thus, the rest of the resources noted in this total come from states with “Holocaust and other genocide” mandates or similar language, which open the door to hosting materials on Bosnia.

⁴² For writings that problematize the sole use of “ethnic cleansing” and similar terminology in the Bosnian context (and others), see Edina Bećirević, *Genocide on the Drina River*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 2014, and Gregory H. Stanton, “‘Ethnic Cleansing’ is a Euphemism Used for Genocide Denial,” *Genocide Watch*, September 10, 2023, <https://www.genocidewatch.com/single-post/ethnic-cleansing-is-a-euphemism-used-for-genocide-denial-1>.

“Balkans” or “former Yugoslavia” obscures it as a case study even more. Beyond that, the numbers indicate that noticeable gaps manifest not only in what American states require from instructors, but what they provide instructors on education on the Genocide in Bosnia and Herzegovina: although some do publicize accessible resources on the topic, most do not, and those that do can propagate materials of mixed educational value, accordingly adding more obstacles in the path of those who wish to raise the issue in the classroom.

But intriguing openings also appear. No state, for instance, confines their mandates, standards, or resources—besides Texas—only to the Genocide in Srebrenica, and instead most, if they discuss Bosnia, refer to a larger Genocide in Bosnia and Herzegovina.⁴³ That opens the door to educators teaching genocide in Bosnia as a comprehensive process enacted against Bosniaks throughout the nation instead of a single massacre in Srebrenica, allowing for instruction on events like the Siege of Sarajevo, the concentration camps in Prijedor, mass conflict-related sexual violence, and others. And since U.S. mandates and curricular standards usually include nomenclature like “other genocides,” nothing governmental necessarily excludes Bosnia from becoming central to classroom engagement with genocide. If anything, that phraseology encourages advocates to bring Bosnia to the fore as an exemplar of genocide for scholastic use, a route already being taken by local activists. Put simply, insufficiencies persist in this realm, yet opportunities for extra education persevere too.

While the United States education system operates primarily at the state level rather than under federal control, more centralized efforts at genocide education have recently emerged, though with a near-uniform focus on the Holocaust. In 2020, the federal government enacted the Never Again Education Act (Public Law 116-140), which expanded Holocaust education curriculum provided by the United

⁴³ “Genocide Against Bosniaks: 1995,” *Texas Holocaust, Genocide, & Antisemitism Advisory Commission*, accessed April 13, 2025, from <https://thgaac.texas.gov/learning/genocides/bosnian>.

States Holocaust Memorial Museum.⁴⁴ This legislation represented an important step toward genocide prevention education, but its scope specifically addressed the Holocaust and antisemitism without mentioning other genocides. Consequently, the curriculum developed under this funding is not required to cover other historical or current genocides. The Act initially provided \$2 million in funding for 2021, with continued support for the following four years. In 2024, Public Law 118-197 extended matching annual funding through 2030 without any reference of genocide(s) beyond the Holocaust.⁴⁵ A simple search reveals abundant Holocaust educational resources already exist, suggesting this funding could have presented a valuable opportunity to develop more comprehensive genocide education beyond the Holocaust. Given this federal emphasis on the Holocaust, individual states have therefore had to take the lead in incorporating other genocides into their education systems through legislative and administrative measures, making them central to any discussion of the current pedagogical landscape facing American genocide instruction.

Pedagogical approaches to the genocide in Bosnia and Herzegovina

In 2022, after initially recognizing the dearth of support for and material on the Genocide in Bosnia and Herzegovina in an American educational context, alongside openings for instruction, detailed above, we embarked on developing curricula on it for U.S. classroom use, hoping to bolster existing state mandates and curricular standards—like Connecticut’s requirement to teach about “Holocaust and other genocides”—and aid educators who might wish to teach Bosnia regardless of governmental

⁴⁴ Never Again Education Act. Pub. L. No. 116–141, 36 U.S.C. § 2301, 134 Stat. 636, (2020), [https://uscode.house.gov/view.xhtml?req=\(title:36%20section:2301%20edition:prelim.\)](https://uscode.house.gov/view.xhtml?req=(title:36%20section:2301%20edition:prelim.)).

⁴⁵ Never Again Education Reauthorization Act of 2023. Pub. L. No. 118-197, 36 U.S.C. § 2301, 138 Stat. 2677 (2024), [https://uscode.house.gov/view.xhtml?req=\(title:36%20section:2301%20edition:prelim.\)](https://uscode.house.gov/view.xhtml?req=(title:36%20section:2301%20edition:prelim.)).

directives. We created comprehensive lesson plans focusing on Yugoslavia's history, the Siege of Sarajevo, the Genocide in Srebrenica, and Concentration Camps in Prijedor and elsewhere, recognizing most American students' limited knowledge of Bosnia and Herzegovina by prioritizing the region's history and cultural diversity before examining specific 1990s events.

Before developing our curriculum, we examined leading genocide education resources from groups including Facing History, the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum (USHMM), the USC Shoah Foundation, the Genocide Education Project, and the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance (IHRA). We studied their pedagogical strategies to inform our work, and in that process, several elements materialized as best practices for what we wished to do. Facing History's approach to teaching challenging histories, for example, is student-centered and guided by its "pedagogical triangle for historic and civic understanding," a framework emphasizing intellectual rigor, emotional engagement, ethical reflection, and informed civic responsibility.⁴⁶ Other established educational frameworks revealed complementary tactics: the USHMM contextualizes genocide within broader historical patterns while focusing on individual stories, the USC Shoah Foundation creates emotional connections between students and survivors through first-person testimonies, the Genocide Education Project provides comparative frameworks to help students understand common elements across different genocides, and the IHRA emphasizes precise historical accuracy alongside empathetic understanding.⁴⁷ With these valuable insights in mind, we initiated our curriculum development.

Thanks to the largely Holocaust-specific nature of these resources, we also gathered insights into how our sources on Bosnia would need to diverge from typical motifs inside Holocaust education. Illustratively, Holocaust education in the United States frequently employs the slogan

⁴⁶ "Our Pedagogy," *Facing History and Ourselves*, accessed April 13, 2025, from <https://www.facinghistory.org/how-it-works/our-unique-approach/our-pedagogy>.

⁴⁷ "Education," *USC Shoah Foundation*, accessed April 13, 2025, from <https://sfi.usc.edu/what-we-do/education>.

“never again” as a framing structure; but the Genocide in Bosnia and Herzegovina represents just one example of the international community’s failure to prevent subsequent genocides, contradicting curricular narratives premised on the Holocaust serving to construe long-standing international prevention. Hope, similarly, is another theme we intentionally tweaked with in our toolkit. While Holocaust curriculum often highlights hope and human compassion during the atrocity, and stresses hope as a message to derive from the Holocaust’s aftermath, this approach does not align with the continuous, multi-faceted genocide denial and stymied justice that Bosniaks still face inside Bosnia. We thereby emphasized modern continuities from the Genocide in Bosnia and Herzegovina to the present instead of producing a universalist moral message that overwhelmingly stressed hope following slaughter. We did, however, integrate themes of “resistance,” “survival,” and “persistence” that consistently appear with hope as concepts found throughout Holocaust historical education.

Our curriculum’s pedagogical foundation, as exemplified by the activities we crafted for it, rests on four core principles that reflect the observations we gained from mainstream genocide education resources: primary source engagement; hands-on project creation that fostered analytical thinking and meaningful storytelling; survivor testimony examination carefully selected for age appropriateness, language accessibility, and time constraints; and comparative analysis between genocides, mass atrocities, and other conflict-related issues. Understanding the practical constraints American educators face, we, moreover, designed each lesson with flexibility to function as a standalone unit while connecting to a broader narrative around the Bosnian Genocide, accommodating various educational contexts from high school to university settings. This malleability accommodates both teachers in mandated classrooms and those in states without explicit “other genocides” mandates, who may have limited capacity to introduce case studies beyond the Holocaust. Indeed, our focus on comparative analysis came, in part, from a desire to allow instructors to easily mix our materials, where possible, with existing Holocaust education when outside constraints appear.

Our first pedagogical foundation, primary source engagement, appears across our lesson plans. With each, we base the information provided to educators and their students on such sources, and we provide a primary source packet that includes materials ranging from live news reporting on the Genocide in Bosnia and Herzegovina to writing done by survivors, like Zlata Filipović's diary. Guiding questions and possible source-based activities, too, accompany every listing. This conveyance allows teachers to humanize historical events, moving beyond chronological fact to reveal the lived experiences undergirding the events seen during the Bosnian War and Genocide. It further encourages educators to teach about Bosnia where they can, as they can easily conduct an activity centered around a particularly pertinent resource at any point in their genocide instruction; for instance, when talking about the aftereffects of mass violence, they might utilize the sources we proffer on post-genocide memorialization in Bosnia, like a live map of the Srebrenica-Potočari Memorial Center, to highlight atrocity-related commemorative practices to students.

Second, we developed a museum artifact activity that engages students in selecting objects related to the Siege of Sarajevo to create an exhibition centered on the event. This hands-on approach promotes analytical thinking while fostering meaningful storytelling, as students struggling to connect with distant historical events can select items that resonate with their personal interests, creating bridges between their lives and the history they are studying. A student dancer, for example, might select a pair of ballet slippers that they found posted on the website of Sarajevo's War Childhood Museum. Educators can extend this activity by encouraging students to manufacture fully realized museum exhibits where students explore selected themes—like resistance movements, women's experiences during conflict, or teenage life under siege. That encourages multimodal expression through music, poetry, visual art, or other media, providing students with creative voices they might not otherwise have in traditional educational settings. Instructors can also arrange for these exhibits to be shared with other classes, parents, and community members, producing intergenerational learning opportunities, particularly meaningful for parents who were themselves children

when these events unfolded and may have knowledge gaps about this historical period. Artistic response exhibits additionally offer structured opportunities for students to process emotional reactions through creative expression. Students can pen poems inspired by survivor accounts, paint visual art exploring memory and healing, plan collaborative performance pieces centered on resilience, and form digital storytelling projects to include in their exhibits, furthering the connection to the material they can forge through their creative expression.

Our third core feature centers on survivor testimony analysis, most overtly for teaching about the Genocide in Srebrenica. We carefully selected diverse testimonies from Srebrenica survivors highlighting experiences before, during, and after the genocide, considering three critical factors: age appropriateness, language accessibility, and time constraints. Despite the genocidal context, certain topics remain challenging to address in American classrooms, particularly sexual violence and torture. American students also often disengage from non-English testimonies, and research indicates diminishing attention spans among today's learners, necessitating shorter selections.⁴⁸ In this activity, students receive short biographies of individuals and develop questions they would want answered, then analyze testimonies to find responses. We explicitly instruct teachers to address the significance of silence and unanswered questions, emphasizing that incomplete historical records are themselves part of understanding genocide's nature.

We finally highlighted comparative analysis between genocides through our concentration camp lesson plan, a tactic that acknowledges how American classrooms focus primarily on Holocaust education and serves as a gateway to teaching the Genocide in Bosnia and Herzegovina within existing curricular frameworks. Students conduct guided research, selecting from lists of camps from both the Genocide in Bosnia and Herzegovina and other mass atrocities. After researching their selected

⁴⁸ Kim Mills, "Speaking of Psychology: Why our attention spans are shrinking, with Gloria Mark, PhD," interview with Gloria Mark, *American Psychological Association*, podcast audio, February 2023, <https://www.apa.org/news/podcasts/speaking-of-psychology/attention-spans>.

sites, students create visual mappings showing various structures and their purposes. These visual tools add layers to students' understanding of the diversity and complexity of concentration camp systems while allowing teachers to meet state mandates regarding Holocaust education by including camps used in the Holocaust as part of the activity's comparative heart. And by using these comparative matrices, guided questions, and analytical frameworks, students can explore warning signs, implementation methods, international legal responses, and commemoration practices across different historical contexts, helping them identify patterns across genocides while respecting the uniqueness of each historical case.

Beyond the above foundations, we have produced additional materials to aid our curricula's implementation. Each lesson plan, for instance, has a professional development resource component that supports educators teaching this content with background reading recommendations. In addition to these background packets, we provide a presentation for contextual purposes. Recognizing the emotional weight of this subject matter, we also developed social-emotional learning activities that can be implemented at any point in the curriculum. The American classroom is not merely an academic space but an emotional one, where students process challenging historical truths that may conflict with their understanding of human behavior. We provide three options for teachers: written reflections, communal discussions, and physical activities. Each approach includes guiding questions to help students process their emotional responses. The physical activity option, which we describe as "walking through their feelings," allows students to engage in movement while reflecting on guided questions, addressing diverse learning needs in typical American classroom settings.

Through these varied pedagogical approaches, our curriculum makes the complex history of the Bosnian War and Genocide accessible and meaningful for students while providing educators with flexible, robust tools to address this important historical moment. By emphasizing personal connection, critical thinking, and creative expression, we hope to ensure this history finds its rightful place in American

education, helping students understand not only what happened but why it matters—bridging a significant gap in historical knowledge while developing the skills necessary for thoughtful engagement with difficult history. In the context of American education, where time is often limited and competing priorities abound, our modular approach allows teachers to utilize components that best fit their classroom needs while still conveying the essential historical significance of the Bosnian war and genocide. That flexibility recognizes the reality of American educational structures where standardized testing often drives curricular decisions, yet creates space for teaching important historical events that might otherwise be overlooked. By connecting our pedagogical tools directly to skills valued in American education—critical thinking, media literacy, research capabilities, and emotional intelligence—we position this curriculum not as an “additional” burden but as an opportunity to develop transferable skills through meaningful historical content.

Conclusion

Much remains to be done for our curricula project, we hope to advance our work by formulating additional units that not only touch on the Genocide in Bosnia and Herzegovina’s events, but also examine the historical, cultural, and communal identity of Bosniaks and how that ethnic consciousness became marked for destruction and nonetheless survived. In doing so, we draw from recent writing from authors like Dara Horn, who have shown that genocide education must stop positioning its targeted subjects as vessels for conveying moral lessons to students and instead demonstrate the full richness of their identities—and how their oppressors aimed to erase it—to foster an understanding of what genocide demolishes, alongside encouraging curiosity about Bosniaks.⁴⁹ This curiosity allows one to note both the particular circumstances that led to the Genocide in Bosnia and Herzegovina and embrace a complex

⁴⁹ Dara Horn, “Is Holocaust Education Making Anti-Semitism Worse?,” April 3, 2023, *The Atlantic*, <https://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2023/05/holocaust-student-education-jewish-anti-semitism/673488/>.

empathy for Bosniaks beyond their suffering in the 1990s. With these units, we aim to develop additional ones that contemplate contemporary issues around Bosnia. More specifically, we plan to make lesson plans that discuss international justice and genocide denial within the country, providing educators further routes toward contemporizing the Genocide in Bosnia and Herzegovina and accordingly helping students grasp its continued significance. We, moreover, wish to incorporate ever more feedback from those instructors who utilize our materials within their classes; after all, a curriculum only fulfills its purpose if it is used to teach.

Challenges, old and new, will naturally arise as this process, and other genocide education efforts, persist, which advocates must address. One must still grapple with the limited time—sometimes down to instructional hours in the single digits—allotted to educators, which will leave many lesson plans only partially implemented and thus necessitating flexibility in all materials produced. Producing interest in Bosnia itself, too, forms another barrier, given how other genocides permeate the American public consciousness more than it does; often, the name Bosnia evokes terms like “war” and “ethnic cleansing” as much as genocide, a tendency that one should tackle in disseminating curriculum on the country. And even if Bosnia eventually attains status as a widely-taught genocide, it will likely encounter issues around knowledge retention and ineffective autonomous teaching approaches that, for instance, plague Holocaust education. At a more fundamental level, legislatures must update mandates, or promulgate new ones, that include Bosnia, and revise, if not issue, curricular standards that denote Bosnia as a genocide that educators must teach. These fresh documents should avoid the generalization and terminological issues discussed in our mandate analysis. State-supported resource pages, too, should aim to incorporate a reasonable selection of sources on Bosnia, vet whatever materials they include for denialist or inaccurate claims, and review existing resources for oversights of such problems to alleviate the difficulties instructors frequently experience in looking for curricular aids on the genocide. Blind inclusion cannot be a solution; rather, a more measured, calculated path is needed.

As for why non-Bosniak actors should embrace the Genocide in Bosnia and Herzegovina as a curricular focus, countless justifications exist. Bosnia contextualizes much of the post-Cold War approach to human rights that the United States and other polities have adopted, forms a consistent callback within discussions of modern genocide, and constitutes the arena where countless aspects of genocide's public perception, legal status, and definition concretized, if not became up for debate.⁵⁰ Because of the ongoing denialism and ethnic polarization facing Bosnia due to the genocide's legacy—whether vis-à-vis Srebrenica and eastern Bosnia or other atrocities like the Markale massacres, Kapija massacre, and the mass sexual violence committed against Bosniaks—it additionally offers students an accessible outlet toward understanding how genocide festers long after killing stops and the damage that not acknowledging it can bring to societies, potentially in tandem with the concept of “triumphalism,” which has gained significant attention in the Bosnian context thanks to the ongoing valorizing of war criminals and the genocide itself by the Republika Srpska.⁵¹ The Genocide in Bosnia and Herzegovina's wide-ranging, public nature—encompassing genocidal tactics from concentration camps to cultural destruction and implicating issues like the role of the media in highlighting genocide and how to commemorate it—also allows for comparison with other atrocities so to maximize classroom instructional time. Because of its

⁵⁰ To sample some of the many works that broach these subjects: Samantha Power, *A Problem from Hell: America and the Age of Genocide*, New York: Basic Books, 2002; David Rieff, *Slaughterhouse: Bosnia and the Failure of the West*, New York: Touchstone, 1996; John Shattuck, *Freedom on Fire: Human Rights Wars and America's Response*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2005; Linda Kinstler, “The Bitter Fight Over the Meaning of ‘Genocide,’” *The New York Times*, August 20, 2024, <https://www.nytimes.com/2024/08/20/magazine/genocide-definition.html>.

⁵¹ For some sources that detail this denial, alongside other negative post-genocide trends, see: “Thousands of Bosnian Serbs attend rally denying genocide was committed in Srebrenica in 1995,” *AP News*, April 18, 2024, <https://apnews.com/article/bosnia-serbs-srebrenica-genocide-denial-56d4c3b1e7dca96a5be28b66a9fcd66a>; Human Rights Watch, “Bosnia and Herzegovina: Ethnic Discrimination a Key Barrier,” December 12, 2019, <https://www.hrw.org/news/2019/12/13/bosnia-and-herzegovina-ethnic-discrimination-key-barrier>.

complicated origins, and the various processes that enabled the genocide's occurrence, it can aid educators in dismantling the simplified narratives around perpetrators, victims, and motivation that often infect genocide education.⁵² Plus, Bosnia's recency, alongside its materialization inside Europe decades after the Holocaust, readily demonstrates to students how genocide comprises a current issue, one that can occur anywhere and that they must stand vigilant against.

Yet for all these hurdles and wider needs, opportunities to work past them present themselves apace. Besides Connecticut, Bosniaks and allies in other states have convinced state legislatures to pass resolutions or laws officially recognizing the Genocide in Bosnia and Herzegovina, plus state governors and commissions to issue statements to a similar effect. Bosniak groups are currently part of coalitions advocating for the Genocide in Bosnia and Herzegovina's (and other genocides) specified inclusion within mandates and standards that exclude it.⁵³ And various community and national organizations strive for Bosniak causes within the United States daily. The movement for Bosnia's space inside the U.S. genocide education system carries on. So too does it outside America's borders, whether in Bosnia itself or nations far afield like the United Kingdom.⁵⁴ We desire our research to assist this effort in devising its goals, strategies, and publicity. We further hope that others can build upon it, and devise their own interventions in education around the Genocide in Bosnia and Herzegovina, to further its implementation globally. After all, this sort of education embodies one of the best means of doing justice to those brutally slaughtered and scarred within Bosnia for who they were and ensuring that they remain remembered despite the genocidal project that hoped to erase them. And for that, it represents some of the least we can do for those lives and all the tragedy, resilience, and survival they personify.

⁵² Horn, "Is Holocaust Education Making Anti-Semitism Worse?"

⁵³ Jacquelyn Jimenez Romero, "Holocaust education requirement fails in WA Legislature," *The Seattle Times*, February 24, 2024.

⁵⁴ For one group advocating for such education abroad, see "About Remembering Srebrenica," *Remembering Srebrenica*, accessed April 13, 2025, from <https://srebrenica.org.uk/about-us>.

References

- A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding the massacre at Srebrenica in July 1995. S. Res. 134, 109th Cong., 1st sess. June 22, 2005. <https://www.congress.gov/bill/109th-congress/senate-resolution/134>.
- “About Remembering Srebrenica.” *Remembering Srebrenica*. Accessed April 13, 2025, from <https://srebrenica.org.uk/about-us>.
- Adeli, Lisa M. “The Bosnian Genocide: Teaching Ideas and Resources.” In *Teaching about Genocide: Advice and Suggestions from Professors, High School Teachers, and Staff Developers*, vol. 3, edited by Samuel Totten, 27-36. Lanham: Roman & Littlefield, 2020.
- Bećirević, Edina. *Genocide on the Drina River*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2014.
- “Bosnia and Herzegovina: Ethnic Discrimination a Key Barrier.” *Human Rights Watch*. December 12, 2019. <https://www.hrw.org/news/2019/12/13/bosnia-and-herzegovina-ethnic-discrimination-key-barrier>.
- Chollet, Derek. *The Road to the Dayton Accords: A Study of American Statecraft*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.
- Colorado Department of Education. *Colorado Academic Standards: Social Studies*. November 2022. <https://www.cde.state.co.us/cosocialstudies/cas-ss-p12-2022>.
- *Connecticut Government Administration and Elections Committee Public Hearing, March 6, 2023*. Connecticut General Assembly 2023 Regular Session (2023). Statement of David Pettigrew. <https://www.cga.ct.gov/2023/gaedata/TMY/2023SB-01158-R000306-Pettigrew,%20David,%20Professor%20of%20Philosophy-Southern%20CT%20State%20University-Supports-TMY.PDF>.

- *Connecticut Government Administration and Elections Committee Public Hearing, March 6, 2023*. Connecticut General Assembly 2023 Regular Session (2023). Statement of Mirzet Muminovic. <https://www.cga.ct.gov/2023/gaedata/TMY/2023SB-01158-R000306-Muminovic,%20Mirzet-Supports-TMY.PDF>.
- Daalder, Ivo H. *Getting to Dayton: The Making of America's Bosnia Policy*. Washington D.C.: Brookings Institution Press, 2000.
- DeBoer, Jennifer. "Centralization and Decentralization in American Education Policy." *Peabody Journal of Education* 87, no. 4, Philadelphia: Taylor & Francis, 2012, 510-513.
- "Education." *USC Shoah Foundation*. Accessed April 13, 2025, from <https://sfi.usc.edu/what-we-do/education>.
- "Educational Resources." *Illinois Holocaust & Genocide Commission*. Accessed April 13, 2025, from <https://hgc.illinois.gov/educational-resources.html>.
- Fallace, Thomas D. *The Emergence of Holocaust Education in American Schools*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.
- Fallace, Thomas D. "The Origins of Holocaust Education in American Public Schools." *Holocaust and Genocide Studies* 20, no. 1, Oxford: Oxford University Press, Spring 2006, 80-102.
- Freedman, Dan. "The Origins of Holocaust Education in American Public Schools." *Moment*. January 24, 2022. <https://momentmag.com/the-state-of-holocaust-education-in-america/?srsltid=AfmBOopi-RsljwT0W2OSWsp-xMu6qMUMLQFdg4tgqjburZzJOhYbzsr4>.
- "Genocide Against Bosniaks: 1995." *Texas Holocaust, Genocide, & Antisemitism Advisory Commission*. Accessed April 13, 2025, from <https://thgaac.texas.gov/learning/genocides/bosnian>.
- Gross, Zehavit, and Stevick, E. Doyle, eds. *As the Witnesses Fall Silent: 21st Century Holocaust Education in Curriculum, Policy and Practice*. Cham: Springer, 2015.

- Hamilton, Daniel S. “Fixing Dayton: A New Deal for Bosnia and Herzegovina.” *Wilson Center*. November 24, 2020. <https://www.wilsoncenter.org/publication/fixing-dayton-new-deal-bosnia-and-herzegovina>.
- Horn, Dara. “Is Holocaust Education Making Anti-Semitism Worse?” April 3, 2023. *The Atlantic*. <https://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2023/05/holocaust-student-education-jewish-anti-semitism/673488/>.
- ICJ. Application of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (Bosnia and Herzegovina v. Serbia and Montenegro). Judgment. 2007. ICJ Rep. 43. <https://www.icj-cij.org/sites/default/files/case-related/91/091-20070226-JUD-01-00-EN.pdf>.
- Jennings, Louise B. “Challenges and possibilities of Holocaust education and critical citizenship: An ethnographic study of a fifth-grade bilingual class revisited.” *Prospects* 40, no. 1, London: Springer Nature, March 2010, 35-56.
- Karčić, Hikmet. “Teaching About the Bosnian Genocide.” In *Teaching about Genocide: Insights and Advice from Secondary Teachers and Professors*, vol. 1, edited by Samuel Totten, 133-142. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 2018.
- Kinstler, Linda. “The Bitter Fight Over the Meaning of ‘Genocide.’” *The New York Times*. August 20, 2024. <https://www.nytimes.com/2024/08/20/magazine/genocide-definition.html>.
- Levine, Hilary, and Tillotson, Tosha. “The Siege of Sarajevo.” *California Teachers Collaborative for Holocaust and Genocide Education*. Accessed April 13, 2025, from <https://cateacherscollaborative.org/education-resource/the-siege-of-sarajevo/>.
- Levine, Hilary, and Tillotson, Tosha. “Understanding the Complex Genocide in Bosnia and Herzegovina: A Contemporary Genocide.” *California Teachers Collaborative for Holocaust and Genocide Education*. Accessed April 13, 2025, from [180](https://cateacher-</div><div data-bbox=)

scollaborative.org/education-resource/understanding-the-complex-genocide-in-bosnia-and-herzegovina-a-contemporary-genocide-1-unit-2-lessons/.

- Matthewson, Paul Warne. “Mandatory Holocaust Education Legislation in the State of Illinois: A Historical Study.” PhD dissertation. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 2015.
- Mendez, Jacqueline, McCormick, Rachel, Watt, Liah, Gamse, Beth, Taylor, Joseph, and García, Elisabet Raquel. “Genocide Education in Massachusetts Middle & High Schools: A Statewide Landscape Analysis & 2023-2024 School Year Grant Outcomes Report.” *Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education*. October 2024. <https://www.doe.mass.edu/research/reports/2024/10-genocide-education.pdf>.
- Mills, Kim. “Speaking of Psychology: Why our attention spans are shrinking, with Gloria Mark, PhD.” Interview with Gloria Mark. *American Psychological Association*. Podcast Audio. February 2023. <https://www.apa.org/news/podcasts/speaking-of-psychology/attention-spans>.
- Mongkol, Chatwan. “New Haven professor raising awareness of Bosnian genocide among CT students, teachers: ‘We’re facing a denial.’” *New Haven Register*. March 27, 2023. <https://www.nhregister.com/news/article/new-haven-professor-commemorating-bosnian-genocide-17856249.php>.
- N1 Sarajevo. “Connecticut declares July 11 as Remembrance Day of Genocide in Bosnia.” *N1*. May 17, 2023. <https://n1info.ba/english/news/connecticut-declares-july-11-as-remembrance-day-of-genocide-in-bosnia/>.
- Oklahoma State Department of Education. *Oklahoma Academic Standards: Social Studies*. February 28, 2019. <https://oklahoma.gov/content/dam/ok/en/osde/documents/services/standards-learning/social-studies/Oklahoma-Academic-Standards-for-Social-Studies.pdf>.

- Oregon Department of Education. *2024 Oregon Social Science Standards*. June 7, 2024. <https://www.oregon.gov/ode/educator-resources/standards/socialsciences/Documents/Final2024SocialScienceStandardsACCESSIBLE.pdf>.
- “Our Pedagogy.” *Facing History and Ourselves*. Accessed April 13, 2025, from <https://www.facinghistory.org/how-it-works/our-unique-approach/our-pedagogy>.
- Palmer, John R. B. “Patterns of Settlement Following Forced Migration: The Case of Bosnians in the United States.” *Grup de Recerca Interdisciplinari en Immigració Working Paper Series* no. 35. Barcelona: Universitat Pompeu Fabra, 2018. <https://repositori-api.upf.edu/api/core/bitstreams/2816062f-0fd0-4df5-b2ed-bb700fc5b5a5/content>.
- Phipps, Sarah. “Kentucky Senate passes resolution declaring July 11 Srebrenica Genocide Remembrance Day.” *WBKO News*. February 27, 2025. <https://www.wbko.com/2025/02/28/kentucky-senate-passes-resolution-declaring-july-11-srebrenica-genocide-remembrance-day/>.
- Power, Samantha. *“A Problem from Hell”: America and the Age of Genocide*. New York: Basic Books, 2002.
- Ragland, Rachel G., and Rosenstein, Daniel. “Holocaust Education: Analysis of Curricula and Frameworks: A Case Study of Illinois.” *The Social Studies* 105, no. 4, Philadelphia: Taylor & Francis, 2014, 175-183.
- “Required Instruction of the Holocaust and Other Cases of Genocide.” *Kentucky Department of Education*. August 2, 2022. https://www.education.ky.gov/curriculum/conpro/socstud/Pages/req_inst_holocaust_genocide.aspx.
- “Resources for Teaching the Holocaust and Other World Genocides.” *Virginia Department of Education*. 2021. <https://www.doe.virginia.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/40737/638086144075130000>.

- Rieff, David. *Slaughterhouse: Bosnia and the Failure of the West*. New York: Touchstone, 1996.
- Romero, Jacquelyn Jimenez. “Holocaust education requirement fails in WA Legislature.” *The Seattle Times*. February 24, 2024.
- Sandler, Alyssa Wiener. “Moving Toward Never Again: State of Holocaust Education in the United States.” *American Jewish Committee*. August 2022. https://www.ajc.org/sites/default/files/pdf/2022-09/Moving-Towards-Never-Again_8.22.pdf.
- “Senator Anwar Votes with Senate to Create Day in Honor of Victims of Bosnian Genocide.” *Connecticut Senate Democrats*. May 16, 2023. <https://www.senatedems.ct.gov/anwar-230516>.
- Shain, Yossi. “Ethnic Diasporas and U.S. Foreign Policy.” *Political Science Quarterly* 109, no. 5, New York: Academy of Political Science, 1994, 811–841.
- Shattuck, John. *Freedom on Fire: Human Rights Wars and America’s Response*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2005.
- Smith, William L. “Do Holocaust education mandates work?” *Phi Delta Kappan* 106, no. 4, Arlington: PDK International, 2024, 42-47.
- Stanton, Gregory H. “‘Ethnic Cleansing’ is a Euphemism Used for Genocide Denial.” *Genocide Watch*. September 10, 2023. <https://www.genocidewatch.com/single-post/ethnic-cleansing-is-a-euphemism-used-for-genocide-denial-1>.
- Stillman, Lindsey. “Mandates on Holocaust and Genocide Education in the United States.” In *Teaching and Learning Through the Holocaust: Thinking about the Unthinkable*, edited by Anthony Pellegrino and Jeffrey Parker, 29-60. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 2022.
- “The NC Holocaust Education Act.” *North Carolina Department of Public Instruction*. September 10, 2024. <https://www.dpi.nc.gov/districts-schools/classroom-resources/academic-standards/standard-course-study/social-studies/nc-holocaust-education-act>.

- “Thousands of Bosnian Serbs attend rally denying genocide was committed in Srebrenica in 1995.” *AP News*. April 18, 2024. <https://apnews.com/article/bosnia-serbs-srebrenica-genocide-denial-56d4c3b1e7dca96a5be28b66a9fcdc6a>.
- Thurber, James A., Campbell, Colton C., and Dulio, David A., eds. *Congress and Diaspora Politics: The Influence of Ethnic and Foreign Lobbying*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2018.
- Totten, Samuel. “Addressing the ‘Null Curriculum’: Teaching about Genocides Other than the Holocaust.” *Social Education* 65, no. 5, Silver Spring: National Council for the Social Studies, 2001, 309-313.
- “US State Legislation Map.” *Echoes and Reflections*. Accessed April 13, 2025, from <https://echoesandreflections.org/interactive-map/>.
- Yonas, Anna A. and van Hover, Stephanie. “Misleading Mandates: The Null Curriculum of Genocide Education.” *Journal of Social Studies Research* 48, no. 4, Amsterdam: Elsevier, 2024, 243-260.