

SIT Graduate Institute/SIT Study Abroad

SIT Digital Collections

Independent Study Project (ISP) Collection

SIT Study Abroad

Spring 2020

The Motif of Children in War in Memorialization Practices in Serbia and Bosnia and Herzegovina

Ana Gvozdić
SIT Study Abroad

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcollections.sit.edu/isp_collection



Part of the [Child Psychology Commons](#), [Eastern European Studies Commons](#), [European History Commons](#), [European Languages and Societies Commons](#), [Peace and Conflict Studies Commons](#), [Social and Cultural Anthropology Commons](#), and the [Social Influence and Political Communication Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Gvozdić, Ana, "The Motif of Children in War in Memorialization Practices in Serbia and Bosnia and Herzegovina" (2020). *Independent Study Project (ISP) Collection*. 3269.
https://digitalcollections.sit.edu/isp_collection/3269

This Unpublished Paper is brought to you for free and open access by the SIT Study Abroad at SIT Digital Collections. It has been accepted for inclusion in Independent Study Project (ISP) Collection by an authorized administrator of SIT Digital Collections. For more information, please contact digitalcollections@sit.edu.

“The Motif of Children in War in Memorialization Practices in Serbia and Bosnia and Herzegovina”

Author: Ana Gvozdíć

Project Advisor: Alina Trkulja
Academic Director: Dr. Orli Fridman

Macalester College
Major: Peace and Conflict Studies

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for Serbia, Bosnia, and Kosovo: Peace and Conflict Studies in the Balkans, SIT Study Abroad, Spring 2020

Table of Contents

1. Abstract	2
2. Acknowledgements	3
3. Introduction	4
4. Context and Literature Review	5
a. Academic and Historical Context of the Research	5
b. Remembering the Past: The Narratives of Victimization	8
c. The Motif of Children in War in Memorialization and Film	9
5. Methodology	11
6. Findings	14
a. Inclusivity in Memories of Children	15
b. Remembering Children in Relation to the Dominant Narratives	19
c. The Impact of Memorializing Children on Peace and Reconciliation	25
7. Conclusion	32
8. Bibliography	34
9. Appendix	37
a. Appendix A: Interview Questions	37
b. Appendix B: Participants Chart	39

Abstract

Studying the War Childhood Museum in Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina, the monument to children killed in NATO bombing in Belgrade, Serbia, as well as the monument to killed children of besieged Sarajevo, this research project examines the motif of children in war within memorialization practices of Serbia and Bosnia and Herzegovina. Relying on six semi-structured interviews with members of civil society in Serbia and Bosnia and Herzegovina, as well as an employee of the War Childhood Museum, this research explores the role that the motif of children in war plays in remembering and portraying the past in these countries with an emphasis on how this motif relates to the dominant narratives of the past and the way it impacts peace and reconciliation efforts. Acknowledging the differences among these forms of memorialization with regard to their ethnically inclusive or exclusive approaches, this research points out the ways in which the incorporation of the child motif can strengthen or challenge the dominant narratives of victimization. Furthermore, it explores the potential of this motif to contribute to peace and reconciliation dependent on its use.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my project advisor, Alina Trkulja, for the support she has provided me with during each of the stages of this research project and all the feedback that helped me improve my written work. I greatly appreciate her balanced approach which allowed me to explore my interests freely and independently while reminding me of important perspectives I ought to consider.

I also owe my thanks to Dr. Orli Fridman for encouraging me to explore the themes of transitional justice and memory and sharing valuable resources with me. I would like to thank my professor dr. Jelena Lončar for sharing her wisdom in the Research Methods course, brainstorming the topic with me, and believing in me more than I did in myself.

This research project would not have been possible without the research participants. I cannot thank them enough for their willingness to share their time and knowledge with me, even during a health crisis.

Finally, I would like to thank my mom and my friends for patiently listening about my research process and sharing relevant points of view with me.

Introduction

In 2018, the War Childhood Museum in Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH) won the Council of Europe's Museum of the Year Award. This award shed light onto the experiences of children in war and conflict – a topic that this museum represents by displaying objects and stories from such children, many of whom are now adults. Attention to the experiences of children also opened my eyes to the frequent use of this motif in memorialization practices not only in Bosnia and Herzegovina, but the region as well. In addition to the War Childhood Museum, this research project focuses on the monument to child victims of NATO bombing in Belgrade, Serbia, as well as the memorial to the murdered children of the besieged Sarajevo. The monument in Serbia features a statue of Milica Rakić, a three-year old girl who died in NATO bombing of Serbia in 1999, but the monument's inscription indicates that it is dedicated to all children who suffered in that bombing. The memorial in Sarajevo is dedicated to the children who died during the siege of Sarajevo and their names are written on seven columns that are part of the monument.

While the War Childhood Museum has been a subject of study of other scholars, the two monuments have received very little attention. Additionally, the child motif itself, rather than the specific memorials, remains rather under-researched. Acknowledging the frequent use of this motif and the lack of a comprehensive analysis of the memorials to children in the literature, I choose to pursue a comparative analysis of these three memorials. The research question that guides my process is: What role does the motif of children in war play in remembering and portraying the past in Serbia and Bosnia and Herzegovina? In exploring this question, I was primarily interested in the ways in which this motif relates to the dominant ways of dealing with the past in the two countries – the victimization narratives – as well as the impact that the use of this motif has on peace and reconciliation. Looking at the ethnic inclusivity or exclusivity in remembering children,

my research highlights the ways in which memorializing children can strengthen or challenge dominant narratives, with different impacts on peace and reconciliation.

Prior to presenting the findings of my research, which relies on six semi-structured interviews, I present the context and the literature review, situating museums and monuments in the field of memorialization as a transitional justice mechanism, and explaining the past that they refer to – the wars of the 1990s in the former Yugoslavia. In this section, I also summarize the research about the dominant approaches to the past in Bosnia and Herzegovina and Serbia through the explanation of the victimization narratives. Finally, I refer to the previous literature about the motif of children in war in the example of a monument in Colombia, but also through the analysis of this motif in film. Having explained the context and summarized the previous literature, I turn to a short explanation of the methodological approach, and then present the findings of my research. I structure the findings of the research by looking at who and what the memorials represent, with a close attention to the ethnically inclusive or exclusive nature of the memorials which connects to the dominant narratives of the conflict. I conclude the analysis by exploring the potential of the motif to support peace and reconciliation efforts.

Context and Literature Review

Academic and Historical Contexts of the Research

Commemorating past atrocities serves as a transitional justice mechanism. Teitel (2003) defines transitional justice as “the conception of justice associated with periods of political change, characterized by legal responses to confront the wrongdoings of repressive predecessor regimes” (p. 69). While the field started with legal responses, it has evolved over time (Bell, 2009). This is why Subotić (2013) explains transitional justice as “a set of mechanisms aimed at addressing legacies of violence”, including truth commissions, reparations, apologies, and memorialization

(p. 266). The relevant mechanism for this paper – memorialization – can take place in different forms: through “monuments, museums, street names, memory sites” or others (Subotic, 2013, p. 267).

Various scholars and international institutions argue that memorialization contributes to goals of transitional justice, including peace, reconciliation, and justice. In terms of benefit to the victims, memorialization ought to acknowledge their suffering and create a platform where they can share their stories and restore dignity through symbolic reparations (Shaheed, 2014; Subotic, 2013). Memorialization is also meant to contribute to peace by consolidating the history of past atrocities and promoting accountability (Shaheed, 2014; Subotic, 2013). Finally, memorialization is supposed to contribute to reconciliation by healing, repairing damaged relationships, and rebuilding trust (Shaheed, 2014). Given that my research is concerned with memorialization practices in Serbia and Bosnia and Herzegovina, it is important to situate these activities in the wider transitional justice field. Furthermore, my exploration of specific sites of memory supplements the theoretical literature about memorialization with empirical data. In the next paragraphs, I turn to a brief summary of the historical events that are the subject of these memorialization practices.

With the break-up of Yugoslavia, armed conflict in Bosnia and Herzegovina lasted from 1992 to 1995. This conflict was “the bloodiest and most protracted phase” of Yugoslavia’s dissolution, given Bosnia’s “nationally heterogenous nature” – the fact that Bosniaks (Muslims), (Bosnian) Croats, and (Bosnian) Serbs, as well as minorities, lived in BiH as they do today (Hoare, 2010, p. 111). The war in BiH included conflict between JNA (Yugoslav National Army) and Serb forces on one hand, and the Croatian and Bosniak forces on the other for most part. There was a conflict between Bosniak and Croat forces at one point too. The war started with the attack on East

Bosnia, a Bosniak-majority territory, by forces from Serbia, and it included acts of ethnic cleansing: “the systematic massacre, expulsion, detention, torture, and rape of non-Serbs” (Hoare, 2010, p. 125). The war brought about “the longest siege in the history of modern warfare, the siege of Sarajevo, which began on 6 April 1992 and lasted until 29 February 1996” (Barkan & Bećirbašić, 2015, p. 96). In 1995, the Serb forces committed genocide against Bosniaks in Srebrenica. Joint Croatian and Bosnian forces, with the support of NATO air-strikes brought an end to the conflict, finally leading to the Dayton Peace Agreement in 1995 (Hoare, 2010).

The conflict in the region continued between Serbian security forces and Kosovo Albanian groups in 1996–9 as well as between Serbian forces and NATO in 1999 (Hoare, 2010, p. 111). Serbian paramilitaries’ attacks on Kosovar Albanians lead to a total number of 1.45 million displaced people when counting internal displacements (Judah, 2008, p. 88). They committed massacres too, and 836 bodies were exhumed and reburied in different locations in Serbia (Judah, 2008, p. 90). NATO responded with a 78-days bombing campaign of Serbia, Kosovo, as well as targets in Montenegro (Judah, 2008, p. 87). NATO’s intervention brought about civilian deaths too: approximately 500 casualties on 90 different occasions. However, Judah (2008) points out that “ironically, a large number of them were Kosovo Albanians who may have been used in columns along the road as human shields by Serbian forces” (p. 89). At the end of the conflict, Serbian forces had to withdraw from Kosovo, while a NATO-led force and the UN administration entered, allowing the return of many refugees. At the same time, many Serbs moved from the towns in Kosovo and today mostly reside in enclaves such as Gračanica (Judah, 2008, p. 92). All of these events reside in the memories of people, and in the next section, I summarize the most common frames for remembering that past.

Remembering the Past: The Narratives of Victimization

A common frame for speaking about the wars of the 1990s in Serbia is one of Serb victimization, most apparent in memories of the NATO bombing. The process of victimization entails presenting both civilians and soldiers as victims. David (2014) provides an example of this narrative when the city mayor of Belgrade “entrenched the idea that all Serbs were victims in the wars of the 1990s” during his official speech, since “civil victims and those who believed they were fighting for the freedom of their homeland were equally considered as victims” (p. 667). Within this frame, the memory of NATO bombing is particularly important. Fridman (2016) explains that “the memory of Serbian victimhood during the 1999 NATO bombing was promoted and elevated, while other events of the wars have been buried in deafening silence” (p. 444). This statement also points out that such victimization brings with it the neglect of other crimes, including those committed by the Serbs. This is why Mihaljinac (2017) claims that this narrative “represents Serbs as the absolute victims of the bombing (repressing the topic of responsibility for war crimes)” (p. 341). Within this discourse the death of Milica Rakić became an important symbol (Mandić, 2016). Since my research looks at the monument with her statue and explores how it relates to dominant narratives in Serbia, it is important to understand the role that NATO bombing and victimization play in Serbia’s remembering of the past.

Similar narratives in Bosnia and Herzegovina illuminate the ways in which memorialization does not support the goals of transitional justice. Sokol describes an important feature of memory politics in Bosnia and Herzegovina since the war: the construction of three memories - the Bosniak, Serb, and Croat one (Sokol, 2014, p. 107). Barkan and Bećirbašić (2015) claim that “each ethnic group in Bosnia and Herzegovina advocates its own particular ‘ethnic truth’” (p. 98). Within these narratives, “everybody wants to be a victim”, which “removes any

(collective) guilt and attempts to evade being marked as an aggressor by others” (Sokol, 2014, p.110). Similar to the context in Serbia, each group perceives themselves as the victim, which makes it hard to take responsibility for crimes. The three narratives in Bosnia are “designed to inflame ethnonational memories with emotional capital to sustain the conflict” (Barkan & Bećirbašić, 2015, p. 97). Looking specifically at monuments, Sokol (2014) claims that they “can be very dangerous, fortify divisions, and even provoke future conflicts” (p.12). Since each group puts forward their interpretation of history according to which they are exclusively the victims, peace and reconciliation prove challenging to achieve. Studying the official remembrance efforts and memorialization in both countries, Subotić (2013) argues that these mechanisms “have been largely used to entrench further mutually incompatible versions of the past and contribute to a renewed cycle of mistrust, untruth, and injustice”, which is in contradiction with the goals of transitional justice (p. 266). Not only is it important to understand the dominant narratives of the past when I study memorialization in BiH, but it is also important to acknowledge previous literature about the complicated relationship between memorialization and transitional justice in the region. Before we turn to examining the role of the child motif in this context, it is important to better understand the motif itself.

The Motif of Children in War in Memorialization and Film

While the motif of children as victims of war or conflict is under-researched, Reyes (2019) studied a monument in Colombia that incorporates that motif. She analyzed the establishment of a memorial to eight children, who were killed by mistake by a police unit, which intended to murder another group of children – children considered “undesirable” due to their recruitment by drug lords. The state built a monument which “portrayed the children as innocent martyrs” and the “judicial and commemorative processes strategically emphasized the victims’ vulnerability and

innocence” (Reyes, 2019, p. 10). However, the monument “did not embody the need to uphold the human rights of all youth, even those marginal young people caught in violent drug, paramilitary, or guerilla wars” (Reyes, 2019, p. 4). For those reasons, Reyes (2019) argues that in emphasizing the innocence of some children, the state “negates non-innocent children, rendering them as un-grievable and thus as unlivable lives beyond the scope of the conceptually human” (p.13). Although her analysis deals with a monument in a completely different context, it provides me with important elements to pay attention to in my own analysis of similar monuments: the emphasis on children’s innocence and the potential for exclusionary nature of such monuments.

Another field where this motif appears is in the literature about war movies, which explores who the children in war represent. Lury (2010) explains how “children are ‘perfect victims’, since they are blameless, they make the wrongs of war seem all the more wrong” (p. 105). In other words, they easily communicate anti-war messages. In movies about children in war “one child’s experience, or more accurately their presence as a small, emotive figure, can be used to ‘stand in’ for many deaths. In these instances, the child’s narrative function is effectively to act as a metonym for wider suffering” (Lury, 2010, p. 107). Based on this literature about representation of children in film, I pay attention to the messages that such motif communicates and whom it represents.

Another relevant insight from Lury’s (2010) work relates not to whom the children represent, but how they are represented. On one hand, she points out that a child “is all too often a vehicle for adult concerns and fears and fails to act or represent its own interests and desires” (Lury, 2010, p. 109). This statement hints at the representation of children in war movies as passive. On the other hand, she also recognizes films in which “children caught up in war are not simply witnesses but agents” (Lury, 2010, p. 144). This overview of representation of children in war movies points out two angles: one in which children are depicted as passive, and another where

they take on an active role of an agent. Although her analysis deals with film, meaning that it includes fictional stories with very different goals, in contrast to memorialization, her research provides valuable insight about the different ways of representing children in war. To explore the role of this motif in memorialization, I conducted my own research.

Methodology

This research relies on six semi-structured interviews, three with participants from Serbia and three from Bosnia and Herzegovina.¹ Five out of six participants are members of civil society organizations (CSOs) that, among other issues related to dealing with the past, deal with the memories of conflict. The justification for interviewing such individuals is that they are knowledgeable about memorialization as a transitional justice mechanism, familiar with the sites of memory that my research focuses on, and informed about the wider context within which these sites exist. The remaining participant is an employee of the War Childhood Museum since that museum is one of the sites of memory that I focus on. I believe that an insider perspective, of someone who actively participates in and shapes memorialization practices that include children represents a valuable point of view for my research. I have interviewed three members of CSOs from Serbia in person as part of the Guided Self Instruction class which included exploring the theme of transitional justice in Serbia in the local language. Hence, these interviews were conducted in the Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian (B/C/S) language. I identified these individuals through their connection to the SIT Serbia program. For example, they facilitated workshops in the past or served as ISP advisors. For the portion of the research in Bosnia and Herzegovina I interviewed two members of CSOs that deal with memory as well as the aforementioned museum employee. I had previously established professional contacts with the former two during the

¹ See the Interview Questions List and the Participants Chart in the Appendix.

WARM Academy in the Summer 2019. I contacted the War Childhood Museum via their info email and the official Facebook page. These interviews too were conducted in B/C/S to ensure methodological consistency. Furthermore, given that it is the native tongue of everyone involved in the research, I believed that it would make everyone most comfortable and enable us to best express ourselves. Although this forced me to translate interviews to English in order to include them in my paper, I felt that I was able to do so accurately as a native B/C/S speaker who has been studying in English for the last six years.

It is important to highlight some differences in interviews and reflect on their significance. I conducted the interviews with participants from Bosnia and Herzegovina through phone or video calls, rather than in-person, due to the COVID-19-related health regulations. Such a format could have a negative impact on the research process since it is much easier to establish good rapport with the participants in person. It was fortunate for me that I have met the CSO members from Bosnia and Herzegovina before, so establishing rapport with them was not hard. This is especially beneficial considering that it was during the interviews with the two of them that I needed to turn off my camera to improve the quality of the connection. Had I been interviewing someone I did not know without the camera I would have been more worried about establishing and maintaining a comfortable interaction. Luckily, in the case of interviewing the museum's employee, as someone I have not met beforehand, we were able to have the cameras on throughout the entire call. Further contributing to a good rapport was our initial brief conversation about the visit that the SIT program was meant to do at the museum and the times in the past when I visited the museum as part of different educational opportunities, which helped associate my research with familiar and trusted programs and partners of the museum.

It is also important to reflect on my positionality and its potential impact for the research. All participants knew that I am from Bosnia and Herzegovina, and it is apparent to them in the way I speak that I was socialized in a Bosnian Croat context. Growing up in such an environment can contribute to a nationalistic bias with regard to the topic of war. This could cause a sense of distance and distrust among the interviewees in Serbia given the dominant relationship between the two political communities. In the case of the participants from Bosnia and Herzegovina, the result could be similar given the context of ethnically divided memories of the war. However, I believe that I have done a lot of independent learning on my own to be aware of such biases. In terms of impact on the participants, it seems to me that my research topic, course of study, association with the SIT program, and willingness to study in Serbia helped alleviate such concerns. My education, on the other hand, can still pose a problem since I study at a US American college. This can detach me from local perspectives, and I seek to overcome that by talking with local experts. It can also develop an anti-Serb bias with negative consequences on my relationship with the participants from Serbia. However, I have not sensed such concerns and have felt to be perceived as a local. At times this meant that the participants would not explain their opinions in detail assuming that I understand. I countered this by posing more questions. On the other hand, my “localness” was beneficial in that it made it easier for me to ensure culturally appropriate behavior.

Related to cultural-appropriateness, I also reflect on the ethical dimension of my research. I acknowledge that my research topic – children in war – is a sensitive one. Since everyone I interviewed deals with the topic of war on a daily basis, I did not feel as though I would be exposing them to harm any greater than they are used to, even if some participants themselves were children during the conflict of the 1990s. Nevertheless, it was important for me to reiterate at the beginning

of the interviews that they may stop the interview in case they feel exposed to unnecessary harm, which was also stated in the consent forms that they signed prior to the start of the interview. I made sure to reiterate the other content of the form too, such as promises of anonymity and confidentiality of the research. I also reminded the interviewees that according to the consent form they need to tell me if they do not want to be recorded and I recorded only after obtaining both their written understanding of the procedure and the verbal consent. It was also important for me to make sure that they understood the research before I started and I offered them opportunities to ask additional questions about the research at numerous points, be it while we were still deciding the time of the interview, or again before I posed my first question. One of the participants requested additional information and a brief list of questions before the interview and I sent them to her. I also informed the participants at the end of the interview that they may reach out to me with any questions or concerns.

Findings

Having explained the research process, I turn to presenting the findings of my research. Building on previous literature regarding inclusivity of monuments to children in conflict, I explain the ethnic representation within the two monuments and the museum that I study. Exploring the ethnic inclusivity or exclusivity of these forms of memorialization creates the foundation upon which to study them within the dominant context of dealing with the past: the victimization narratives. Within these narratives, I pay close attention to the emergence of “oppositional” monuments in Bosnia and Herzegovina, or monuments that communicate the competing narratives of victimhood. In the section “Remembering Children in Relation to the Dominant Narratives” I connect ethnically exclusive and oppositional memorialization to the dominant narratives, but also explore the potential of ethnically inclusive memorialization to challenge the

official context. In the section “The Impact of Memorializing Children on Reconciliation and Peace” I further explore the inclusivity of these memorials with regards to their impact on peace and reconciliation, but also consider the ways in which the motif of children in war more broadly can affect these processes.

Inclusivity in Memories of Children

Previous literature about the monument in Colombia raises the issue of inclusivity in memorialization of children in conflict, and the participants raise this concern too (Reyes 2019). The monument in Serbia, symbolized through the statue of Milica Rakić, commemorates only Serb children. Participants in this study who are from Serbia, comment on the ethnically exclusive nature of the monument. Participant 2 pointed out that:

“In Batajnica [Milica’s neighborhood] a mass grave was found where 75 Kosovar children were buried, not buried but thrown away. This is also a kind of link, and it happened in the same time period, during the NATO intervention, but we don’t see that here, we see only Milica” (personal communication, March 11, 2020).

In other words, she expressed her dissatisfaction with the fact that the monument to children who died during the NATO intervention excludes the Kosovo Albanian children whom citizens of Serbia murdered during the same time period and whose bodies were found in the same location. Participant 1 reiterated this point, adding that he finds it hypocritical and that it hurts him a lot (personal communication, March 9, 2020). Participant 2 extended the criticism of the monument’s exclusivity to other ethnic groups too:

“If we only put Milica, and we don’t put Blerim [Albanian name] or Ahmed [Bosniak name] or, I don’t know, Igor from Croatia, we are sending a message that we only care about Serb children, that only Serb future matters to us, and not the future of other countries” (personal communication, March 11, 2020)

While the monument in Colombia excludes “those marginal young people caught in violent drug, paramilitary, or guerilla wars” (Reyes, 2019, p. 4), the monument in Serbia excludes children who are not of Serb ethnicity.

A similar issue shows up for the monument to children in Sarajevo, although not as clearly. Ristić (2018) pointed out that certain politicians perceive the title of this monument as exclusive because *besieged* Sarajevo refers to the Bosniak parts of the city. However, she claims that “it would be inaccurate to argue that the monument thus operates as a tool for ethnic exclusion as its seven columns list the names of children of all ethnicities who were killed during the war” (p. 191). The opinions of the BiH participants on this topic do not provide a definitive answer. Participant 5 stated that “from the perspective of Republika Srpska, this monument is dedicated to only one category, ‘their’ [Bosniak] victims” (personal communication, April 22, 2020). While this monument does contain the names of Serb children, the exclusion of the Serb children through the name of the monument – a monument to children of *besieged* Sarajevo – contributes to the Bosnian Serb perception of the monument as one for just Bosniak victims. Such a perception is apparent in the actions of Bosnian Serb political leaders who felt compelled to erect a “memorial to the innocently killed children from the area of East (Serb) Sarajevo” (“SJEĆANJE Podignut Spomenik Stradaloj Djeci Srpskog Sarajeva - Opcija,” 2018). This can be interpreted as a sign that they do not feel as though their constituents are represented in the first monument. Participant 3, on the other hand, only mentions the following:

“I know that there was some problem about the names of the children because there were only children of besieged Sarajevo, and not children of the entire Sarajevo (...). I know that there were, let’s say, many negative reactions in civil society, but I am really not familiar with it” (personal communication, April 16, 2020).

Participant 6 does not at all mention the ethnic representation related to this monument when asked about it. Although the exclusionary nature of the monument is more debated than in the case of the monument in Belgrade, this example too raises the question of inclusivity with regards to monuments to children in war.

The participants of the research voice strong opposition to such an approach. Bothered by the exclusion of Albanian and other children from the monument in Belgrade, Participant 1 points out that “in my opinion it would be a lot better (...) to build an inclusive monument, and that means for all children who suffered in the wars in the former Yugoslavia” (personal communication, March 9, 2020). Participant 2 mentions that she thinks “this monument would be much better, much more effective if Milica were there with her friends, with all of the friends she would have met had it not been for the war” (personal communication, March 11, 2020). She goes on to say that “the memory of child suffering should be inclusive, and include the memory of suffering of all children, and not just our children. Not just Milica, but all other children who are part of the Serb, Bosniak, Albanian, Croatian people, all people” (personal communication, March 11, 2020). In Bosnia and Herzegovina, Participant 5 laments the lack of inclusive monuments. She states that “unfortunately, there isn’t a united memorial, not in a sense [that it is] for all children who died” (personal communication, April 22, 2020). She does say that “this is something that has been talked about for a long time. There are victims’ associations who are talking about a possible monument for children (...) which would unite all, without ethnic or national specifications” (personal communication, April 22, 2020). On a similar note, Participant 4 mentions “an initiative to build a monument for children who were murdered in Prijedor during the war, which does not carry an ethnic prefix, does not [specify] to which ethnic group the children belonged (...) That is a positive

example for me” (personal communication, April 16, 2020). In these statements, both participants from BiH indicate their support for inclusive monuments, much like their colleagues from Serbia.

Such inclusive approach does manifest itself in the War Childhood Museum. Participant 4 stated that “there isn’t an ethnic prefix and the museum is all-encompassing. It doesn’t want to be, even though it is based in Sarajevo, it doesn’t want to be Sarajevo-centric, but it deals with the experiences of all children from Bosnia and Herzegovina” (personal communication, April 16, 2020). In this statement, the participant reiterates previous findings, which emphasize “the Museum’s commitment to collect narratives about the war from those who have lived through it as children, irrespective of their ethnic belonging” (Takševa, 2018, p. 4). However, she also applauds its effort to go beyond Sarajevo. The Participant 6 (a museum employee) explains that they set up research centers in four other cities to collect stories, and after the closure of these centers, they created a system for compensation of travel costs for those who wish to come to Sarajevo to record their story and donate an object to the museum (personal communication, April 24, 2020). Commenting on the fact that they feature stories regardless of the children’s ethnic background, she simply states that “that was very natural, and it was not a matter of question at all” (personal communication, April 24, 2020). Their inclusivity extends beyond the borders of Bosnia and Herzegovina since they feature stories from other countries in the region, like Croatia, but also related to different and ongoing conflicts with stories from Syria. In that sense, the War Childhood Museum stands out as an inclusive example. Having recognized the differences in regard to inclusivity in these forms of memorialization, I rely on these findings to illustrate the different roles these monuments play.

Remembering Children in Relation to the Dominant Narratives

Milica Rakić serves as a metonym for Serbian suffering in NATO bombing. Representing more deaths through the image of a single child is apparent in the conceptual design of the monument whereby the statue of Milica Rakić stands in for the children who died in NATO bombing, as the inscription below her statue explains. Previous literature pointed out that “Milica became a symbol for all the innocent civilian victims of NATO bombing”, indicating that she represents not just all children, but victims of adult age too, and the participants share this view (Mandić, 2016, p. 465). Participant 2 pointed out that “she is a motif which is used when talking about NATO bombing as an example of a soulless killing of a people” (personal communication, March 11, 2020). Participant 3 explained that “when talking about NATO bombing, an example that is used so much that it is unbelievable, is the story about Milica Rakić” (personal communication, March 12, 2020). All of these points communicate the idea that the death of Milica Rakić does not represent the death of a single child but symbolizes the deaths of all innocent Serbs. In that sense, she is a metonym for wider suffering – a kind of representation that mimics what Lury (2010) describes.

My participants interpret the representation of wider suffering through Milica’s image as a manipulation of her story. Participant 1 stated that “unfortunately the children who suffered during NATO bombing are being misused and the tragedy of their families is being manipulated” (personal communication, March 9, 2020). He elaborates that “there is a manipulation of the suffering of children for the creation of a narrative about the eternal victimhood of the Serb nation” (personal communication, March 2020). Participant 4 from Bosnia and Herzegovina shares such interpretation of this monument when saying that:

“the message [of the monument] is to make it clear that this is some kind of aggression and maybe, I would even say, in a certain moment that there is a use of children for exactly that purpose especially with the visual, conceptual design of the monument with the statue of the girl” (personal communication, April 16, 2020)

In this monument, the participant recognizes the portrayal of NATO as an aggressor, which serves as a flip side of the argument about Serb victimhood. Since this message stems from a statue of a single victim, the participants view it as a form of manipulation of her individual story.

In that sense, the monument to child victims of NATO bombing in Belgrade strengthens the dominant narrative for dealing with the past in Serbia – the victimization narrative. Participant 1 summarizes the official culture of memory in Serbia through the following two features:

“one talks about the suffering, or violence against (...) the Serb people; and on the other hand, from that defeat, the defeat of nationalist politics of Serbia as a former republic in Yugoslavia, [comes] the placing of blame on other nationalistic behavior or other actions of the international community” (personal communication, March 9, 2020)

Describing the dominant narratives of the past in Serbia, this participant emphasizes the victimhood of the Serbs and the simultaneous shifting of blame onto other actors. Such interpretation of the past is materialized in the monument to child victims in Belgrade, for which Participant 2 states that:

“the message [of the monument] is, or what I read from it, is that this was an unjust aggression (...) but behind that you do not see what happened during the so-called aggression – we call it NATO intervention – that during the period of NATO bombing the largest number of crimes was committed against the Kosovo Albanians” (personal communication, March 11, 2020)

Hence, the monument strengthens both strands of the victimization narrative – the suffering of the Serbs at the hands of NATO while simultaneously omitting the responsibility for crimes in Kosovo. Participant 3 describes such a memorialization process as “frozen”, claiming that the Serbian society cut out the period of NATO bombing “out of context, took that one part and said: ‘Here you go! Here you can see a man with crutches, let’s find the culprit!’” (personal communication, March 12, 2020). In a similar fashion, remembering the death of a child represents

a moment in history chosen in support of the perception of Serbs as only victims and NATO as the only aggressor.

To further contribute to the victimization narrative, the memory of NATO bombing relies on exaggerated numbers of victims – a strategy that the monument in Sarajevo uses too. Commenting on the monument in Belgrade, Participant 1 says: “one of my reservations is that (...) in building the narrative about the dying in NATO bombing, false information and false data is used (...) Serbia is, we could say, a champion in the region in exaggerating the numbers of victims” (personal communication, March 9, 2020). He goes on to point out that “Humanitarian Law Center established the exact number of victims in NATO bombing (...) which is 754, but you will see every March when the anniversary of NATO bombing is commemorated, you have a range of 2500 to 4500 victims” (personal communication, March 9, 2020). In other words, facing a monument that is meant to symbolize the deaths of all innocent victims in Serbia, the participant expresses his frustration with the inaccurate information spread in the public about the total numbers of deaths. The monument to children in Sarajevo faces such criticism too. Puhalo (n.d.) points out that news stories about that monument include the information that there were 1600 child victims. The monument includes the names of 502 children, while the remaining were meant to be engraved at a later date (Risić, 2018). However, research centers do not seem to indicate that there are 1100 more names to be added. A research center tied to the University of Sarajevo documented 524 child victims (Čekić et al., 2010). The research of the NGO Research and Documentation Center, on the other hand, documented 711 child victims, among these 614 civilians and 97 soldiers (Puhalo, n.d.). Given these findings, the broadly accepted number of 1600 deaths seems unfounded. In other words, both countries exaggerate the number of victims, which can be seen as a strategy to strengthen their image as victims.

However, it is important to point out the different perspectives regarding the victimization landscape in Bosnia and Herzegovina that the research participants voice. When talking about the culture of memory in that society, Participant 4 describes “a victimization of your own group, in the sense that we are always the victims, they are the bad people, those who committed the crimes; our group has never done anything” (personal communication, April 16, 2020). While Participant 5 shares this perception too, she complicates this image when saying that there are “divisions: we as the victims, and them as the offenders, while, as I said, in some general narrative we do agree that we have all suffered, but one group was a bigger victim, and another group was bigger offenders, perpetrators” (personal communication, April 22, 2020). On a political level, the victimization narrative is not as simple either. A participant pointed out that “certain political leaders recognized the war crimes of their group, but they did not do well in the next elections” (personal communication, April 16, 2020). She also pointed out that the Bosniak political leaders visited the graves of Serb victims in Kazani and laid flowers but did not work to set up a monument there. Interpreting this act, she found it to be only symbolic and superficial (personal communication, April 16, 2020). Participant 5 shared how the opinions of political leaders vary and that “they simply go towards what they think can get them most political points” (personal communication, April 22, 2020). In that sense, while emphasizing the victimhood of a single ethnic group is a common phenomenon within Bosnia and Herzegovina too, there seems to be more recognition of suffering of all groups and changing attitudes among the political leaders.

An important feature of remembering in Bosnia and Herzegovina is a competitive approach based on ethnic belonging which manifests in memories of children too. As explained previously, each group in Bosnia and Herzegovina presents their own ethnic truth (Barkan & Bećirbašić, 2015). Participant 5 describes this when saying “the way our society remembers the past is divided,

in the way the Dayton Agreement divided our society according to ethnic groups, that's approximately how we remember the war" (personal communication, April 22, 2020). Studying the three different narratives, Sokol (2014) points out the emergence of counter-memorials or oppositional memorials. An example of an oppositional memorial would be a memorial complex in Kravice dedicated to Serb victims of the Second World War and the war of the 1990s, which is located near Srebrenica, and its commemoration is held the day after the Srebrenica one (Sokol 2014). The establishment of the monument to children from East Sarajevo in response to the monument of the besieged Sarajevo represents another oppositional monument. In this example, the memory of children in besieged Sarajevo and East Sarajevo materialize the competing, ethnically coded narratives in Bosnia and Herzegovina's culture of memory.

While the support for the competing victimization narratives in the monuments above stems from their association with a single ethnic group, the War Childhood Museum puts forward a universal representation of children in war. Not only does the museum feature stories from all ethnic backgrounds in Bosnia and Herzegovina, it covers stories from other countries too. For this reason, Participant 3 believes that the museum "talks about the universality, I would say, of the children's experience of war (...) regardless of where a conflict happens, the experiences are simply very, very similar" (personal communication, April 16, 2020). In these examples, the memory of children in a certain conflict is elevated to symbolize the universal experience of children in conflict, which represents a different take on Lury's (2010) metonym for wider suffering. However, I find it important to emphasize that the employee of the museum, Participant 6, explained that "somehow it became very quickly clear how we all [children in war] remember that period in a different way and that we all experienced it differently for a variety of reasons", adding

an important nuance to the universal representation of war experience (personal communication, April 24, 2020).

In that sense, the War Childhood Museum challenges the dominant narratives, but at a cost. Participant 4 stated that “it is absolutely not a principle that the museum promotes, that it needs to clearly state who the victim is, who is guilty, who is responsible, but it simply talks about that experience and why every war and conflict is wrong” (personal experience, April 16, 2020). This indicates a difference in the museum’s approach in a context where the narratives seem to be dominated by emphasizing one’s own victimhood and blaming the other, despite the nuance outlined above. Being recognized by outside bodies, such as the Council of Europe, and receiving awards for their work speaks to the successes they achieve in challenging the system that they work in. However, as the employee of the museum explained to me, they received no support while finding a place for a permanent location and they need to pay the full rent price, which is unusual for cultural institutions (personal communication, April 24, 2020). Participant 4 says: “in my opinion, the obvious reason why the museum is not supported by the authorities is because it does not do ... does not propagate the narrative of besieged Sarajevo, of only Bosniak victims, but deals with the universal experience of children in war”, calling such attitude towards the museum “devastating” (personal communication, April 16, 2020). The dominant system also makes it hard for the museum to pursue their educational activities: Participant 5 shared “that it is very hard for them to go to Republika Srpska and work there with children, and gain access to work there in schools. Why? Because they come from Sarajevo and it is Jasminko² and not some other name”, implying that he is associated with the Bosniak community, which impacts their access (personal communication, April 22, 2020). In other words, while the museum is making great success in

² i.e Jasminko Halilović, the founder of the War Childhood Museum

promoting an alternative way of remembering the past through experiences of children regardless of their ethnicity, the context in which it operates is not supportive, and even creates barriers. Despite these obstacles, I consider what impact such a way of portraying the past has on peace and reconciliation, in comparison to the other examples.

The Impact of Memorializing Children on Reconciliation and Peace

When speaking about memorialization practices that contribute to reconciliation, an important factor seems to be honoring the deaths of an ethnic group different from your own. Almost all participants mentioned the work of the Women in Black, an NGO in Belgrade, that holds annual commemorations of the Srebrenica genocide in Belgrade the day before they go to Srebrenica to join the commemorations. Speaking about the meaning of these actions in both of the countries, Participant 1 explained that “as much as they are marginalized here, those women, they are... for example, the commemoration of the genocide in Srebrenica Potočari cannot happen without them, you understand?” (participant communication, March 9, 2020). In other words, while the commemorations they hold in Belgrade are not popular locally, their presence in Srebrenica is essential. Lack of their popularity at home is not surprising given the narratives about Serbian victimhood explained above. However, the significance of their presence in Srebrenica reveals an important contribution of memorialization for reconciliation: the acknowledgement of crimes by those who come from Serbia. Participant 1 points out that this is so significant because it communicates the message that “they are not all the same”, countering the dominant narratives put forth by the media in Serbia and the Republika Srpska which tend to “negate the genocide in Srebrenica” (personal communication, March 9, 2020). The fact that actions like this one shows that not everyone in Serbia shares that opinion, the participant argues, “continues to keep the reconciliation process open” (personal communication, March 9, 2020).

This insight about the impact of memorialization helps evaluate the role of memorializing children in reconciliation. It has been explained above that the participants from Serbia disapprove of the fact that the monument in Belgrade does not commemorate children other than Serb children. Since that element of acknowledging crimes that have happened to others is lacking, this monument ought not to contribute to reconciliation. Participant 1 explains in more detail why this can be so by asking:

“So what would people think seeing this [the monument] if they were to come from a culture which cherishes that the children of Kosovar Albanians died and so on. You know, let’s say if I were that child, I don’t know that I would like to come to Belgrade again” (personal communication, March 9, 2020).

In posing this question, he points out that a monument that conceals the crimes committed to Kosovo Albanians, instead of acknowledging them, would not create trust and cultivate a positive relationship among Serbs and Albanians - in other words, would not contribute to the process of reconciliation.

Another negative impact of memorialization on reconciliation has to do with inflaming ethnic divides through competing narratives. Sokol (2014) explains that:

“in divided societies, memorials can be very dangerous, fortify divisions, and even provoke future conflicts. In fact, monuments in Bosnia and Herzegovina construct and reinforce mutually exclusive narratives that are part of the ethno-national identities, and as such are instruments of identity building. Memory initiatives are very rarely directed towards civic nation-building that would include all the ethno-national groups. Instead, identity consolidation is carried out on the level of the ethno-national groups, within which monuments only serve to strengthen divisions” (p.121)

Sokol (2014) is saying that monuments, which strengthen mutually exclusive narratives in their processes of ethno-national identity building, are harmful for intergroup relations. Using this insight to evaluate the use of children in monuments in Sarajevo does not give very optimistic responses. While the inclusivity of the monument to children of besieged Sarajevo is debatable, the existence of a similar memorial, but dedicated to specifically Serbian victims, establishes an

oppositional relationship between these two monuments, as explained previously. In that sense, we may recognize competing narratives in these two monuments, which according to Sokol, would be harmful for group relations. However, what happens if memorialization of children does not emphasize their ethnicity?

Remembering children in a way that does not emphasize their ethnicity could contribute to reconciliation. Talking about the War Childhood Museum, as a diverse example, Participant 4 stated that:

“all of that can contribute to the process of reconciliation and dealing with the past because children are exactly someone who should not be put in certain, I would say, ethnic or national groups because they are children, who did not choose that, right? (...) So I think that this is something that can definitely contribute to reconciliation and understanding the universality, that a victim is a victim regardless of the group they belong to” (personal communication, April 16, 2020).

In a way this statement combines the two benefits to reconciliation explained above: recognizing the victimhood of a person without emphasizing the ethnicity of the victim. Participant 1 pointed out that “the motif of pure innocence, something that is true only for children, is incredible. It can have an incredible impact on the reconciliation process, an incredible one!” (personal communication, March 9, 2020). If recognizing someone as a victim is important for reconciliation, that might be easier done in the case of a victim whose innocence appears to be, or in fact is, non-debatable. Given these insights, the War Childhood Museum’s inclusive approach to remembering children seems to be a form of memorialization beneficial for reconciliation.

However, the Museum itself emphasizes a different element of its work in the reconciliation process – its emphasis on healing – stemming from its unique perspective of remembering those who suffered but survived. When asked about the impact of memorialization on reconciliation, the museum’s employee pointed out the importance of “not only staying on the topic of the memories related to that period but also the period after and the continuation of life. I

think that this is important because it sends that message that life goes on after conflict” (personal communication, April 24, 2020). However, what does emphasizing that life goes on have to do with improving relationships between people? She explains: “I think that contributing to individual wellbeing is very important for the entire community so I think that through that there is a direct relation between one and the other” (personal communication, April 24, 2020). Museum’s emphasis on the children’s ability to continue with their lives despite going through a traumatic experience contributes to their individual healing, which translates onto societal healing as well – a process that entails improved relationships among people.

This approach comes out of the museum’s commitment to commemorate children in war as active agents. Participant 6, the museum’s employee, explains that:

“What is really important for us is not to represent those who grew up during the war, or those whose childhood was influenced by war or some armed conflict, to not represent them as victims, to of course validate their experience as very traumatic, but also [to show] that we all have some coping mechanisms, ways to deal with the situation and everything around us, and that is true for children too” (personal communication, April 24, 2020)

In memorializing the personal experiences of those whose childhood was affected by war, it is important for them to acknowledge their ability to deal with that situation. She emphasizes “representing children’s way to influence the people around them, what they were dealing with ... Representing them as active agents, and not just as passive victims who can’t... who are affected by the society, and who do not affect the society” (personal communication, April 24, 2020). This is particularly important to them because of the feedback that they got from people [who were children during the war]: “that they seek validation, for it is a difficult experience, but also that they are strong and able to find the resources to deal with the situation” (personal communication, April 24, 2020). She also pointed out that many of them conclude their story submissions for the museum by emphasizing how they were able “to continue with their everyday lives” (personal

communication, April 24, 2020). In documenting the experiences of children in war, who are now grown up adults, the museum honors the desire of those people to be represented as active agents, rather than passive victims. Such representation echoes one kind of representation of children that Lury (2010) notices in films: the representation of children as active agents. While in this case the museum emphasizes the children's resilience in a way that supports reconciliation efforts, the portrayal of children's vulnerability can communicate a strong message for peace.

An important element of the child motif is that it represents a group perceived as the most vulnerable group. Examining the portrayal of children in war movies, Lury (2010) explains that looking at children in war brings about a "feeling [of] sorry for those who cannot care for themselves and for those we believe should be cared for as some kind of universal right (pp. 105-106). Such perception of children shows up in my interviews too. When talking about the messages that memorials of children can communicate, participant 2 explained how

"putting the children [in memorialization practices] sends a message that in pretensions to territory suffer those whom it least concerns and those who are the most vulnerable category of our society; for whom we all have the responsibility to take care of them, and not put them in those kinds of dangers" (personal communication, March 11, 2020).

Commenting on the monument for the children in Belgrade, Participant 5 points out that children are "the most vulnerable category of our society, a societal category which did not have control over their lives in any moment, and could not choose what will happen, where they will be, and so on" (personal communication, April 22, 2020). In other words, previous literature and my research indicate that in studying the memorials which feature children in war, perception of children as a vulnerable group stands out.

Thanks to the identification of children as a vulnerable group, memorials featuring this motif are thought to convey an important message for peace. Participant 2 claims that such memorials "send the message that the consequences of our political deliberations reach the

smallest pores of our society; that political reasoning must always keep in mind what it can bring about and that certain decisions made on the top of the political hierarchy must be considered from that standpoint too” (personal communication, March 11, 2020). She goes on to say: “but somehow no one thinks about what happens with communities when they enter armed conflicts, especially what happens to the most vulnerable parts of society, such as minorities, women, children” (personal communication, March 11, 2020). In other words, the participant argues that memorializing children in war reminds the observers that high-ranking politicians’ decisions harm the most vulnerable, and that the memory of such loss helps warn us about the horrific nature of war. Speaking specifically about the impact of the War Childhood Museum in Sarajevo, Participant 4 explains that the museum “talks about that [child] experience and why every war and conflict is wrong and who the most vulnerable groups are” (personal communication, April 16, 2020), reiterating the point that memorializing children as a vulnerable group helps put forward the message that war is wrong.

The anti-war message of memorials to children in war makes it an important tool for education about peace. The War Childhood Museum utilizes its collection to develop workshops for children with the goal of “raising their awareness about all the different childhoods that exist, about the advantages associated with a peaceful childhood in comparison to childhood in war” (Takševa, 2018, p. 14). An encouraging consequence is that the children “start to tell [them] about how peace is important” and they promise to be “guardians of peace” (Takševa, 2018, p.14). Through this experience of the War Childhood Museum’s founder, which he shared with Takševa, we see that remembering the children who suffered in war can also teach the new generations about the importance of peace. Participant 5 confirmed this impact when commenting on the work of the museum and saying that “the museum itself presents a very difficult image to children in a

very interesting way (...) and we strengthen the awareness among children about why peace is important and why we should never enter war again” (personal communication, April 22, 2020). In other words, memorializing children who were impacted in war and sharing their experience with young people today serves as a tool for peace education.

Given these different impacts of the memorials featuring children in war, the participants conclude that this motif can communicate very positive and powerful messages – but dependent on how they are used. Participant 2 shares:

“I think that the motif of children and the suffering of children can actually help get together all the people with different opinions about that [matter] and reach a consensus at least there, that this is something no one wants to happen. If we can’t agree about anything else, perhaps this is something that we can agree on, that we do not want to see consequences like these anymore” (personal communication, March 11, 2020)

For this reason she considers this motif “the most effective, the most striking motif that can be used in memory politics”; however, she draws the line by saying “but of course even here exist some exceptions, some limitations regarding how far we can go, without it being reduced to an exploitation of children or encroachment on their privacy” (personal communication, March 11, 2020). Participant 4 shares the same perspective when she says that “by using this motif we can send a powerful and good message, but it all depends on the way in which we present it” (personal communication, April 16, 2020). Participant 1 also recognizes a massive potential in “initiatives to, without a pathetic approach, without a manipulation of the children’s suffering or similar things, to narrate the war, the entire war, through children’s perspective” (personal communication, March 9, 2020). Commenting on the stories of survivors, he says that they “can be a link that can really lead to reconciliation, especially keeping in mind that those children are now grown-ups and they all, regardless of their background, can hear that they just wanted a piece of candy” (personal communication, March 9, 2020).

Conclusion

Relying on semi-structured interviews, this research project examined three memorials that feature the motif of children in war: the War Childhood Museum in Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina, the memorial to the killed children of besieged Sarajevo in the same city, and the monument to children killed in NATO bombing in Belgrade, Serbia. An obvious distinction between these monuments from the start of the research project had to do with the exclusion of children based on ethnicity in the case of the monument in Belgrade, and to a lesser extent the monument in Sarajevo, contrary to the inclusive approach of the War Childhood Museum. Building on this observation, I pointed out the different roles that these forms of memorialization play in remembering the past in their respective countries. In the case of the monuments in Belgrade and Sarajevo, this meant the strengthening of the dominant approaches to the conflicts of the 1990s: the narratives of victimization of the ethno-national group, which in the context of Bosnia and Herzegovina also imply a competitive or oppositional approach given the state's multiethnic population. The War Childhood Museum, on the other hand, plays a different role in challenging such an approach to the past, although the system in which it operates inevitably leaves a mark. Closely related to their roles is the memorials' ability to influence peace and reconciliation. The ethnic emphasis of the monument in Belgrade and the oppositional position of the monument in Sarajevo seem ill-suited for the reconciliatory impact of memorialization within which the acknowledgement of crimes occupies an important role. On the other hand, the War Childhood Museum not only escapes the competitive victimization narratives through its inclusive approach, it also creates space for individual healing – both of which seem supportive of reconciliation processes. The benefit of the child motif for peace also depends on the way it is used: the vulnerability of children can facilitate

an anti-war message in memorialization processes that feature such a motif, as long as they do not rely on a kind of manipulation or exploitation of the children's stories.

This research only scratches the surface when studying the motif of children in memorialization practices. Within this under-researched field, this research builds on explorations of singular forms of memorialization that utilize this motif (Reyes, 2019) and the analyses of this motif in a different field - film (Lury, 2010). It does so by looking at only three case studies due to the limitations of time and resources. Further research should explore other examples of memorialization that include children in conflict in the region and globally. Generating a larger sample would allow us to address some of the following angles, which this study fails to do. This research focuses on ethnic representation of the monuments as a starting point of the analysis, while paying less attention to other relevant factors, such as the difference between memorializing victims and survivors, which further research should focus on. It should also pay closer attention to the differences in memorials to children in war depending on their creator's profile as a private or a state actor. It would also be valuable to consider the impact of different forms of memorialization -- this study only looks at monuments and a museum, while the motif of children can appear in digital archives, street names, oral histories, and many others. A more diverse sample of such memorials could potentially indicate certain similarities and differences in the role and impact dependent on their form. All further study of this topic could potentially lead to guidelines about the most effective and appropriate use of this motif in memorialization practices since, as the research participants pointed out, the motif carries immense value for peace and reconciliation, but only as long as it is used appropriately.

Bibliography

- Barkan, E., & Bećirbašić, B. (2015). The Politics of Memory, Victimization, and Activism in Postconflict Bosnia and Herzegovina. In J. Thompson, *Historical justice and memory*. The University of Wisconsin Press.
- Bell, C. (2009). Transitional Justice, Interdisciplinarity and the State of the “Field” or “Non-Field.” *International Journal of Transitional Justice*, 3(1), 5–27.
- Čekić, S., Šestanović, M., Karović, M., & Mastalić-Košuta, Z. (2010). *Zločini nad djecom Sarajeva u opsadi*. Univerzitet u Sarajevu Institut za istraživanje zločina protiv čovječnosti i međunarodnog prava.
- David, L. (2014). Mediating international and domestic demands: Mnemonic battles surrounding the monument to the fallen of the wars of the 1990s in Belgrade. *Nationalities Papers*, 42(4), 655–673. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00905992.2013.874995>
- Fridman, O. (2016). Memories of the 1999 NATO Bombing in Belgrade, Serbia. *Südost Europa*, 64(4), 438–459. <https://doi.org/10.1515/soeu-2016-0041>
- Hoare, M. A. (2010). The War of Yugoslav Succession. In S. P. Ramet (Ed.), *Central and Southeast European Politics Since 1989* (pp. 111–136). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511803185.010>
- Judah, T. (2008). *Kosovo: What everyone needs to know*. Oxford University Press.
- Lury, K. (2010). Mud and Fairytales: Children in Films about War. In *The child in film: Tears, fears and fairy tales*. Tauris.
- Mandić, M. (2016). Official Commemoration of the NATO Bombing of Serbia. A Case Study of the Fifteenth Anniversary. *Südosteuropa*, 64(4), 460–481.

- Mihaljinac, N. (2017). Victimization as a strategy of the artistic representation of the past: The case of the NATO bombing of the FRY. *Temida*, 20(3), 339–355.
<https://doi.org/10.2298/TEM1703339M>
- Puhalo, S. (n.d.). *Djecu vam neću oprostiti*. Retrieved April 26, 2020, from
<https://www.frontal.ba/blogovi/blog/60657>
- Reyes, A. M. (2019). The monument to the children of Villatina: Commemorating innocent child victims in the context of lethally stigmatized youth in Colombia. *Visual Communication*, 18(3), 379–398. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1470357219832798>
- Ristic, M. (2018). *Architecture, Urban Space and War: The Destruction and Reconstruction of Sarajevo*. Springer International Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-76771-0>
- Shaheed, F. (2014). *Report of the Special Rapporteur in the field of cultural rights, Farida Shaheed: Memorialization processes (A/HRC/25/49)*. United Nations General Assembly Human Rights Council.
- SJEĆANJE Podignut spomenik stradalnoj djeci Srpskog Sarajeva—Opcija. (2018, September 13). *Opcija*. <https://opcija.net/sjecanje-podignut-spomenik-stradalnoj-djeci-srpskog-sarajeva/>
- Sokol, A. (2014). War Monuments: Instruments of Nation-building in Bosnia and Herzegovina. *Politička Misao : Časopis Za Politologiju*, 51(5), 105–126.
- Subotic, J. (2013). Remembrance, Public Narratives, and Obstacles to Justice in the Western Balkans. *Studies in Social Justice*, 7(2), 265–283.
- Takševa, T. (2018). Building a Culture of Peace and Collective Memory in Post-conflict Bosnia and Herzegovina: Sarajevo’s Museum of War Childhood: Sarajevo’s Museum of War Childhood. *Studies in Ethnicity and Nationalism*, 18(1), 3–18.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/sena.12265>

Teitel, R. G. (2003). Transitional Justice Genealogy. *Harvard Human Rights Journal.*, 16, 69–94.

Appendix

Appendix A: Interview Questions

1. How does the Serbian/Bosnian society remember the wars of the 1990's in your opinion?
 1. What is the state policy regarding this topic, and how do citizens approach it? Is there a difference between these two approaches, and if so, what is it?
2. What impact does the international community have on memory in Serbia/Bosnia and Herzegovina, if any?
3. Can you tell me something more about the civil society's work regarding the memory of the wars of the 1990's?
 1. How much impact do you think that civil society has on remembering the wars of the 1990s?
4. Have you heard of examples that use the motif of children as victims of war in remembering the wars of the 1990s?
 1. Have you heard of examples in your country? In the region?
5. What do you think about this monument (*show the image of the monument to children victims of NATO bombing in Belgrade*)?
 1. Do you know what this monument is?
 2. What, in your opinion, is the message of this monument?
 3. Why was it erected?
 4. Do you know of similar monuments in your country?
6. What do you think of the War Childhood Museum?
 1. What is the message of the museum?
 2. What impact do you think this museum has?

7. The War Childhood Museum includes objects from all three sides of the conflict. What do you think about their decision to do that?
8. What is the role of museums, monuments, and other forms of remembering the wars for reconciliation?

Adjusted Questions for the War Childhood Museum Representative

1. How does the Bosnian society remember the wars of the 1990's in your opinion?
 1. What is the state policy regarding this topic, and how do citizens approach it? Is there a difference between these two approaches, and if so, what is it?
2. What impact does the international community have on memory in Bosnia and Herzegovina, if any?
3. Can you tell me something more about the civil society's work regarding the memory of the wars of the 1990's?
 1. How much impact do you think that civil society has on remembering the wars of the 1990s?
4. **How did you decide to engage with the motif of children as victims of war in your book and the museum?**
 1. **What message do you intend to send through your book and the museum?**
 2. **What impact do you hope to have through the museum?**
5. The War Childhood Museum includes objects from all three sides of the conflict. **How did you decide to curate your museum in such a way?**
6. Have you heard of examples that use the motif of children as victims of war in remembering the wars of the 1990s in BiH or the region **other than the War Childhood Museum?**

7. What do you think about this monument (*show the image of the monument to children victims of NATO bombing in Belgrade*)?
1. Do you know what this monument is?
 2. What is the message of this monument?
 3. Why was it erected?
 4. Do you know of similar monuments in your country?
8. What is the role of museums, monuments, and other forms of remembering of the wars for reconciliation?

Appendix B: Participants Chart

Participant	Sex	Organization	Field of Work	Interview Date
Participant 1	Male	Forum ZFD Serbia	Civil Society	March 9, 2020
Participant 2	Female	Helsinki Committee for Human Rights in Serbia	Civil Society	March 11, 2020
Participant 3	Male	Youth Initiative for Human Rights Serbia	Civil Society	March 12, 2020
Participant 4	Female	Forum ZFD BiH	Civil Society	April 16, 2020
Participant 5	Female	Post-Conflict Research Center	Civil Society	April 22, 2020
Participant 6	Female	War Childhood Museum	Museum	April 24, 2020