

Introduction

“Settlers came to the Southeast / To stand here at their posts / As the farthest watch of the Reich. / German will then accomplished / What no other could before: / A new homeland [Heimat] for our people [Volk].”¹ In August 1942, the *Banater Beobachter*, a German-language daily newspaper published in the town of Grossbetschkerek in the Serbian Banat, printed the Nazified version of the German folk song about the eighteenth-century Habsburg general Eugene of Savoy. Whereas the original extolled Prince Eugene’s martial prowess, the later version foregrounded his role in the colonization of then-South Hungary by German-speakers after the expulsion of the Ottomans, tying these distant events to the involvement of the settlers’ descendants in the Nazi war for racial regeneration and territorial expansion in Europe.

The song posited a long-standing struggle to preserve the settlers’ Germanness – an ineffable, yet fundamental, quality of “being German” – in the face of foreign cultural influence and emphasized military service as an enduring bond between the German nation and its scattered members abroad. This idealized narrative of German historical experience far from the national heartland culminated in a direct correlation between the eighteenth-century settlers and their descendants’ place in Nazi-dominated Europe: “Adolf Hitler, our oath of loyalty / Accept today once again / As from Prince Eugene’s soldier!”²

The past and the present were unified in a supposedly eternal German nation, undivided by different historical experiences or settlement areas. The song suggested that every location inhabited by Germans bore the stamp of their triumph over hardship; their warlike might; and their ability to reshape any area in their image, making it an extension of Germany. More specifically, it foregrounded the Serbian Banat as such a place, in which a German presence made all the difference, separating the Banat

¹ Nikolaus Britz, “Prinz-Eugen-Lied,” reproduced in “Prinz-Eugen-Feier in Grosskikinda,” *Banater Beobachter* [henceforth *BB*], August 19, 1942, p. 5.

² *Ibid.*

2 Introduction

from its geographic and cultural surroundings in Southeast Europe, implied to be the bastion of backwardness and savagery. Last but not least, the song implied that, by 1942, to be a German had the same meaning as being a follower of Adolf Hitler.

The German minorities in Southeast Europe during World War II were not the easternmost German populations in Europe, given the presence of ethnic German (Volksdeutsche) communities in Poland and the Soviet Union. Yet their depiction as the “farthest watch of Reich” reflected a view of them by the National Socialist government in Germany as a bulwark against the savagery of the “East.” Already in the Weimar era, ethnic Germans were portrayed in German literature as an advance guard of the Greater Reich, people who lived in “far-flung posts . . . in the midst of a foreign land.”³ In the Nazi period, specifically Southeast-European ethnic Germans earned praise as the Reich’s bulwark or outpost.⁴

When the Nazis looked at East Europe, they saw both threat and opportunity, not only a menace but also a territory open to conquest, racially and culturally inferior yet rife with possibility if brought under German control. The idea of ethnic Germans as the Reich’s outpost and bulwark was also meant to appeal to the Banat Germans themselves. Put forth by their Nazified wartime leaders, in a newspaper that sought to reconcile Nazi tropes with the Banat German viewpoint, this image of the Banat Germans revealed not so much their claim to equality with Germans from the Reich (Reichsdeutsche) as the fundamental ambivalence of their position in the Nazi New Order.

This book is a microhistory of the ethnic Germans in the Serbian Banat during World War II. It analyzes their collaboration with the Third Reich, highlighting the intersections of Nazi ideology, the complexities of German nationalism, and German minority behavior in an area far from the Reich’s borders. This book focuses on the ethnic German perspective and how the Banat Germans retained and exercised their agency within the Nazi paradigm, while remaining susceptible to the same tensions and pressures as all professed members of the German Volk.

This is also a transnational history of a specific region and the ethnic group that came to dominate it during the war, a case study as well as an example of how broader patterns of ideology, nationalism, occupation, and collaboration interacted. It explores hierarchies and inequalities contained within the seemingly monolithic model of the German nation

³ Hans Naviasky, *Gesamtüberblick über das Deutschtum ausserhalb der Reichsgrenzen* (Munich: Verein für das Deutschtum im Auslande, 1922), p. 20.

⁴ Heinz Brunner, *Das Deutschtum in Südosteuropa* (Leipzig: Verlagsbuchhandlung Quelle & Meyer, 1940), p. 57; Hans Herrschaft, *Das Banat. Ein deutsches Siedlungsgebiet in Südosteuropa*, second edition (Berlin: Verlag Grenze und Ausland, 1942), p. 64.

proffered by National Socialism; the surprising flexibility of Nazi racial categories when applied to ethnic Germans – people of ostensibly German descent who were not German citizens; and the reasons for, extent of, and scope of Banat German collaboration with the Nazis.

The Banat is a geographic region of fertile flatlands in Southeast Europe, split since 1918 between Romania and Serbia – the latter was then a part of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, from 1929 known as the Kingdom of Yugoslavia. Between April 1941 and October 1944, the Serbian half of the Banat was under German military occupation, but its daily administration and security were left up to its 120,000-strong ethnic German minority (20% of the Banat's population). Led by a dedicated core of local Nazis, the Banat Germans were a population of predominantly peasants and craftspeople, long accustomed to seeing their Germanness as a mark of distinction in an ethnically mixed, predominantly Slavic area.

In Nazi plans for the future of Europe, the Banat and Southeast Europe were of secondary importance compared to the conquest of Lebensraum (living space) in Poland and the Soviet Union. This opened up possibilities for the Banat Germans to exercise their agency in ways not available to the racially suspect ethnic Germans of Poland or Ukraine, whom the Reich Germans saw as fit to kill Jews and persecute Slavs, but not to wield any actual power or enjoy even partial territorial autonomy.

The Banat Germans were a unique case in Hitler's Europe. They were the German minority group to which the Nazis granted administrative control over their home region and preferential access to local power and resources, second only to Reich Germans. Their leaders wielded more influence over the lives of co-nationals and other Banat residents than was true of any other ethnic German community during World War II, which was limited to lowly forms of collaboration and subject to endless 'sifting' for suspected racial pollution.

At the same time, the Banat Germans were not exceptional in their overall dependence on the Third Reich for military protection, ideological legitimation, and approved scope of activity. They remained junior partners to the Third Reich, which continued to see them as second-class Germans. Collaboration failed to cement their position as the Reich Germans' racial kin. Instead, it guaranteed that Banat Germans became associated with Nazi crimes, even while full membership in the Nazi Volksgemeinschaft (national or people's community) continued to elude them.

Nazi racial categories proved flexible enough to accommodate likely collaborators, but not to overcome Nazi suspicion of Germans from places other than Germany. The Volksdeutsche Mittelstelle, VoMi

4 Introduction

(Ethnic German Liaison Office), an offshoot of the SS charged with regulating ethnic German affairs, was created in 1937. In early 1938, a Reich Chancellery memo defined ethnic Germans rather vaguely as persons “whose language and culture are of German origin, but who do not belong to the German Reich as its citizens.”⁵ This and other documents left the matter of what made someone German open to interpretation, acknowledging the importance of language and culture, yet stressing racial affinity with Germans from the Reich as crucial.⁶

The Reich Germans’ attitude to ethnic Germans – an uneasy mixture of suspicion of racial mixing, condescension, and ideologically dictated support – illuminated the complexities and ambivalences of German nationalism refracted through Nazi ideology. This nationalism was defined by strong regional currents and a nation-state, as well as ascriptive factors: culture, language, local tradition, history, and ethnicity. The elasticity and nebulousness of Nazi racial categories served as both incentive to collaboration and hindrance for ethnic Germans’ acceptance as equal members of the Volk. The Nazi bureaucracy delayed having to determine a baseline of Germanness until after the hoped-for victory in World War II, but it also expected ethnic Germans to embody its purely subjective criteria of national belonging.

This near-willful ambivalence on the Nazis’ part had the practical effect of driving the Banat Germans to ever more incriminating forms of collaboration, in a bid to prove their fitness for inclusion in the German Volk (people or nation) by attempting to equate Germanness with National Socialism. The Banat Germans professed enthusiasm for German rule during the Tripartite Pact’s invasion of Yugoslavia in spring 1941. The Serbian Banat ultimately was occupied by German forces due less to Nazi ideology than in order to prevent armed conflict between Romania and Hungary for possession of the region. Throughout the occupation period, Banat Germans’ aspirations to equality with Reich Germans hinged on their usefulness to the Third Reich.

Under the leadership of Josef “Sepp” Janko, since 1939 Volksgruppenführer (Nazified community leader) in Yugoslavia, the Banat Germans rendered valuable administrative service to the thinly stretched Reich German personnel in Serbia. Instead of screening them minutely, as it did to ostensible Germans in Poland and the Soviet Union, the Third Reich allowed the Banat Germans to maintain their community cohesion in order to better exploit their willingness to collaborate. Choosing not to

⁵ Hans Lammers memo, January 25, 1938, NARA, RG 242, T-81, roll 417, fr. 5,163,331.

⁶ German Interior Ministry memo, March 29, 1939, NARA, RG 238, entry 170, roll 4, doc. NG-295, frs. 432–433; Egon Leuschner, *Nationalsozialistische Fremdvölkpolitik* (Berlin: Rassenpolitisches Amt der NSDAP, 1942), p. 18.

resettle them, the Reich used the Banat Germans as a diplomatic bargaining chip and an economic and military resource in the Southeast. Nazi relations with the Banat Germans were thus tempered by several factors in addition to ideology: economic and strategic necessity, diplomatic and legal precedent, prioritizing some aspects of Nazi policy (the Holocaust, anti-partisan warfare) over others (furthering ethnic German interests).

For their part, the Banat Germans significantly altered their home region and contributed to the widespread destruction and suffering in Yugoslav lands during the war, while attempting to balance their attachment to the Banat and their place in it with their desire for equality with Reich Germans. They used Nazi tropes and central aspects of Nazi ideology – anti-Slavism, anti-Semitism, devotion to *Heimat* (homeland) – to talk about their worldview, historical experience, and sense of attachment to the Banat as well as a German Volk unlimited by Germany's borders. They supplied the Nazi war machine with food for German troops and attempted to further their own economic position in the Banat, often at the expense of other ethnic groups such as Jews, Roma, and Serbs, yet without resorting to open persecution of most non-Germans.

The Banat Germans did participate in the persecution of the Banat Jews and the Aryanization of their property. In spring 1942, Banat German men were recruited into the *Waffen-SS* division “Prinz Eugen” and took part in brutal anti-partisan operations in Serbia, Bosnia, and Croatia. Their recruitment by the *Waffen-SS* was merely the logical extension of their earlier collaboration with the Nazis, which also cemented the Banat Germans' enduring association with Nazi violence in the memory of their victims and former opponents.

In late summer and early fall 1944, most Banat Germans remained in their home area rather than attempt escape before the advancing Allied forces. They bore the brunt of retribution when the postwar Yugoslav government laid the blame for the savage internecine warfare among the country's various ethnic groups at the feet of the Germans – those from the Reich as well as the Yugoslav German minority. By the war's end, in the eyes of the Nazis and the Allies alike, to be an ethnic German meant, for all intents and purposes, to be a Nazi collaborator, regardless of age, gender, or individual wartime actions. Yet during the war, the Banat Germans' view of themselves – not only as Germans but also as ethnic Germans, and especially as *Banat* Germans distinct from other German groups – remained multilayered rather than compatible with a streamlined ideological and racial model of the German Volk.

Ethnic Germans, in general, and Banat Germans, in particular, attempted to balance the Nazi view of them with their own ideas about their place in Adolf Hitler's grand scheme. The Banat Germans became

6 Introduction

both the object and the agent of Nazi racial fantasies and their violent implementation. Far from being mere passive recipients and unquestioning executors of Nazi wishes, the Banat Germans exercised their agency throughout the Nazi period. Leaders and ordinary Banat Germans alike made choices for a variety of reasons, within specific circumstances: the Nazi attitude to them, Nazi requirements from them, personal and ethnic relations inside the Banat, the military situation in Southeast Europe, etc. Their options diminished and became more stringent and binding over time – nevertheless, the Banat Germans continued to make choices until the very end of the Banat's occupation and the defeat of the Nazi regime.

Paradoxically, Banat German agency confirmed their subordination to the Third Reich's interests in Southeast Europe. Every modicum of power and all privileges the Banat Germans gained during World War II, they gained with Nazi approval and in the Nazis' rather than their own best interest. Collaboration was the means of Banat Germans' empowerment as well as what kept them under the Third Reich's thumb.

Sometimes individual Banat Germans expressed disapproval or reservations about certain Nazi policies yet, overall, they remained compliant and complicit with – if not always enthusiastic about – the reality of occupation and their position as the most powerful group in the Banat. Because they were executors of German policy rather than policymakers in their own right, for the Banat Germans to prove themselves good Germans came to mean proving themselves good Nazis, even as their Nazism continued to overlap imperfectly with their Germanness and their ability to dominate their home area with its ethnically mixed population underlined their subordinate position vis-à-vis Reich Germans.

As a case study of collaboration and the spread of National Socialism beyond Germany's borders, this book argues that the Nazi treatment of the Banat Germans was often a matter of expedience and practical necessity as much as, if not more than, ideology. It also foregrounds the Banat German minority as a factor in the disparate experiences of World War II in the largely peaceful Banat and other parts of Yugoslavia, which were riven by competing resistance movements, brutal occupation policies, and civil warfare.

Moreover, this book presents the Banat German perspective and experience as historical factors of equal importance as the Nazi attitude to the Banat Germans. It addresses the issue of Banat German agency and choices and demonstrates how this relatively small German minority, in an area of secondary importance to Nazi plans and on the periphery of Hitler's wartime sphere of influence, navigated the tension field of Nazi ideology, racial policy, diplomacy, warfare, and local interests. Ultimately, this is a book that decentralizes the history of World War II

in Europe from a Reich-centric perspective and shows how events in peripheral areas and the actions of certain minority groups interacted with policy imposed from above.

Literature and Themes

During World War II, the Serbian Banat remained a region between nation-states.⁷ With regard to its ethnic Germans, the interplay of minority nationalization and great-power ideology created a microcosm of broader developments yet remained rooted in place-specific pressures and dynamics, which sometimes diverged from patterns evident in other parts of the German sphere of influence. The Banat Germans in World War II illuminated general trends in the history of the Third Reich at war. They were also, first and foremost, a case study unto themselves.

During the Cold War, ethnic Germans' behavior in World War II tended to be subsumed under one of two paradigms: a communist view of all ethnic Germans as Nazis and war criminals or an ethnic German expellee perspective, which painted them as innocent victims of communist persecution.

The official historiography of World War II in postwar Yugoslavia portrayed Yugoslav Germans as a treacherous “fifth column,” subsuming the varieties of ethnic German behavior and the reasons behind it under a blanket assumption of total Nazification. Yugoslav historians tended to assume that German hatred of Slavs had simmered for centuries, only to erupt in wartime violence and mass murder. This primordialist approach served a political purpose: it blamed Germans for wartime violence rather than dredge up the legacy of violence perpetrated by Serbs, Croats, Bosnian Muslims, as well as Germans, Italians, and others. Bland claims that the ethnic Germans' postwar fate fell outside of these works' scope signaled that official history was not open to scholarly discussion.⁸ An exception to this trend was the Slovene historian Dušan Biber, whose sophisticated analysis of Nazification among the Yugoslav

⁷ This was also the case in wartime Transylvania, see Holly Case, *Between States: The Transylvanian Question and the European Idea during World War II* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2009).

⁸ Nikola Božić and Ratko Mitrović, “Vojvodina i Beograd sa okolinom u planovima Trećeg Rajha,” *Zbornik za društvene nauke*, No. 48 (1967), pp. 116–125; Venceslav Glišić, *Teror i zločini nacističke Nemačke u Srbiji 1941–1944*. (Belgrade: Rad, 1970); Božidar Ivković, “Uništenje Jevreja i pljačka njihove imovine u Banatu 1941–1944” in *Tokovi revolucije* (Belgrade, 1967), pp. 373–402; Božidar Ivković, “Zatvori, koncentracioni logori i radni logori u Banatu od 1941–1944. godine,” *Zbornik za društvene nauke*, No. 39 (1964), pp. 108–134; Josip Mirnić, *Nemci u Bačkoj u Drugom svetskom ratu* (Novi Sad: Institut za izučavanje istorije Vojvodine, 1974); Đorđe Momčilović, *Banat u narodnooslobodilačkom ratu* (Belgrade: Vojnoizdavački zavod, 1977).

8 Introduction

Germans in the 1930s compared dynamics at work in different parts of interwar Yugoslavia. However, Biber's study covered only the period until the 1941 invasion.⁹

Memoir literature by ethnic German expellees fell on the other side of the Cold War divide, depicting the Banat Germans before 1944–1945 as apolitical peasants or, at worst, benign German nationalists untainted by anti-Semitism or militarism. Expellee authors tended to elide the war years as unimportant or uneventful, focusing instead on the ethnic Germans' postwar suffering. They blamed violent impulses ostensibly inherent in communist ideology and Slavic, primordial hatred of Germans for their postwar persecution.¹⁰ Memoir literature thus reached conclusions remarkably similar to those proffered by historians in socialist Yugoslavia, even if they produced diametrically opposed interpretations of wartime events. The emphasis on supposed long-standing ethnic hatreds lent the Nazification and eventual persecution of ethnic Germans an air of inevitability, obviating the need to contextualize and explain ethnic German behavior except in the very broadest terms.¹¹

Starting in the 1990s, historians in former Yugoslavia sought to explain how the circumstances surrounding the creation of the second Yugoslavia in 1945 – including the postwar persecution of the Yugoslav Germans and memory culture in socialist Yugoslavia – contributed to the country's

⁹ Dušan Biber, *Nacizem in Nemci v Jugoslaviji 1933–1941* (Ljubljana: Cankarjeva Založba, 1966).

¹⁰ Josef Beer, *Donauschwäbische Zeitgeschichte aus erster Hand* (Munich: Donauschwäbische Kulturstiftung, 1987); Hans Diplich and Hans Wolfram Hockl, ed., *Wir Donauschwaben* (Salzburg: Akademischer Gemeinschaftsverlag, 1950); Sepp Janko, *Weg und Ende der deutschen Volksgruppe in Jugoslawien* (Graz and Stuttgart: Leopold Stocker Verlag, 1982); Otto Kumm, "Vorwärts Prinz Eugen!" *Geschichte der 7. SS-Freiwilligen-Division "Prinz Eugen"* (Osnabrück: Munin-Verlag, 1978); Hans Rasimus, *Als Fremde im Vaterland. Der Schwäbisch-Deutsche Kulturbund und die ehemalige deutsche Volksgruppe in Jugoslawien im Spiegel der Presse* (Munich: Arbeitskreis für donauschwäbische Heimat- und Volksforschung in der Donauschwäbischen Kulturstiftung, 1989); Josef Volkmar Senz, *Geschichte der Donauschwaben. Von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart* (Vienna and Munich: Amalthea, 1993); Harold Steinacker, *Das Südostdeutschum und der Rhythmus der europäischen Geschichte* (Munich: Verlag des Südostdeutschen Kulturwerkes, 1954); Johann Wüscht, *Ursachen und Hintergründe des Schicksals der Deutschen in Jugoslawien. Bevölkerungsverluste Jugoslawiens im Zweiten Weltkrieg* (Kehl: Self-published, 1966).

¹¹ This form of memory culture was officially sanctioned by the West German government in the 1950s. Theodor Schieder – a historian with ties to scholarly circles, which had aided the Nazi government to prepare and implement its violent population policies in East Europe – presided over the editing of a multivolume compilation of expellee reports. The accompanying biased analysis of the 1944–1948 expulsions emphasized German suffering over earlier German complicity with Nazi crimes. See Mathias Beer, "Im Spannungsfeld von Politik und Zeitgeschichte. Das Grossforschungsprojekt 'Dokumentation der Vertreibung der Deutschen aus Ostmitteleuropa'," *Vierteljahrshefte für Zeitgeschichte*, Vol. 46, No. 3 (July 1998), pp. 345–389.

violent disintegration in 1991–1992. They examined the second Yugoslavia's legitimization through the targeting of certain groups, ethnic Germans included, and the concomitant official culture of silence regarding certain aspects of wartime violence.¹²

These works have tended to critique the failures of postwar memory rather than examine the wartime context. My book explains and contextualizes the Banat German role in events between 1941 and 1944 and ties them to patterns of Nazi domination over Europe rather than fold wartime events into a discussion of postwar retribution and the misremembered past or assume that Nazism and its adherents were self-explanatory and, therefore, easily dismissed following their defeat.

General histories of World War II in Yugoslav lands by émigré historians Stevan K. Pavlowitch and Jozo Tomasevich have provided a valuable corrective to the simplistic narrative proffered by the postwar Yugoslav government of a struggle between the Partisans – the communist resistance movement that eventually created the second Yugoslavia – and their opponents: the Germans, the Italians, the Ustašas (Croatian fascists), and the Četniks (the Serbian royalist-nationalist resistance).¹³ Other authors have shed light on native collaboration and the complex ethnic dynamics of warfare in Serbia, Croatia, and Bosnia.¹⁴ Building on

¹² Jovan Bajford, *Staro Sajmište: Mesto sećanja, zaborava i sporenja* (Belgrade: Beogradski centar za ljudska prava, 2011); Vladimir Geiger, *Folksdojčeri: Pod teretom kolektivne krivnje* (Osijek: Njemačka narodnosna zajednica, 2002); Zoran Janjetović, *Between Hitler and Tito: The Disappearance of the Vojvodina Germans* (Belgrade, 2000); Slobodan Maričić, *Susedi, dželati, žrtve: Folksdojčeri u Jugoslaviji* (Belgrade and Pančevo: Centar za dokumentaciju o vojvođanskim Nemcima, 1995).

¹³ Stevan K. Pavlowitch, *Hitler's New Disorder: The Second World War in Yugoslavia* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2008); Jozo Tomasevich, *War and Revolution in Yugoslavia, 1941–1945: Occupation and Collaboration* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2001).

¹⁴ Ana Antić, "Police Force under Occupation: Serbian State Guard and Volunteers' Corps in the Holocaust" in *Lessons and Legacies X: Back to the Sources: Reexamining Perpetrators, Victims, and Bystanders*, ed. Sara R. Horowitz (Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press, 2012), pp. 13–36; Max Bergholz, "The Strange Silence: Explaining the Absence of Monuments for Muslim Civilians Killed in Bosnia during the Second World War," *East European Politics and Societies*, Vol. 24, No. 3 (Summer 2010), pp. 408–434; Jovan Byford, "Willing Bystanders: Dimitrije Ljotić, 'Shield Collaboration' and the Destruction of Serbia's Jews" in *In the Shadow of Hitler: Personalities of the Right in Central and Eastern Europe*, ed. Rebecca Haynes and Martyn Rady (London and New York: I.B. Tauris, 2011), pp. 295–312; Alexander Korb, "A Multipronged Attack: Ustaša Persecution of Serbs, Jews, and Roma in Wartime Croatia" in *Eradicating Differences: The Treatment of Minorities in Nazi-Dominated Europe*, ed. Anton Weiss-Wendt (Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2010), pp. 145–163; Damir Mirković, "Victims and Perpetrators in the Yugoslav Genocide 1941–1945: Some Preliminary Observations," *Holocaust and Genocide Studies*, Vol. 7, No. 3 (Winter 1993), pp. 317–332; Sabrina P. Ramet and Sladjana Lazić, "The Collaborationist Regime of Milan Nedić" in *Serbia and the Serbs in World War Two*, ed. Sabrina P. Ramet and Ola Listhaug (Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), pp. 17–43.

10 Introduction

pioneering work on the Wehrmacht's role in the Holocaust in the East,¹⁵ historians have explored the overlapping influences of resistance operations, anti-partisan warfare, and collaboration in Southeast Europe.¹⁶ My book builds on these multifaceted narratives in order to draw out the role the Banat Germans played in their home region and Yugoslav lands as a whole.

With regard to Nazi policy toward ethnic Germans, Valdis O. Lumans's study of the VoMi provides an interpretative framework in institutional history but is less concerned with ethnic German perspectives.¹⁷ A few German-language monographs have examined the Banat Germans in the period from 1941 to 1944, notably Akiko Shimizu's narrative history, which uses few Serbian-language sources; Ekkehard Völkl's comparative study of the Banat's German and Hungarian minorities; and Mariana Hausleitner's work comparing the ethnic Germans in the Serbian and Romanian Banats, with an emphasis on the latter.¹⁸ Karl-Heinz Schlarp's study of German economic policy in occupied Serbia remains a valuable source on the Banat German

¹⁵ Omer Bartov, *Hitler's Army: Soldiers, Nazis, and War in the Third Reich* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1992); Saul Friedländer, "The Wehrmacht, German Society, and the Knowledge of the Mass Extermination of the Jews" in *Crimes of War: Guilt and Denial in the Twentieth Century*, ed. Omer Bartov, Atina Grossmann, and Mary Nolan (New York: The New Press, 2002), pp. 17–30; Hannes Heer, "Killing Fields. Die Wehrmacht und der Holocaust" in *Vernichtungskrieg. Verbrechen der Wehrmacht 1941–1944*, ed. Hannes Heer and Klaus Naumann (Hamburg: Hamburger Edition, 1995), pp. 57–77.

¹⁶ These works demonstrate that World War II in the partitioned Yugoslav lands involved several overlapping civil wars as well as foreign occupation and anti-partisan warfare. Groups and individuals changed sides, sometimes more than once. The situation was further complicated by attempts on all sides to attract support – the Četniks from among the ethnic Serbs in Serbia and Bosnia, the Germans from among ethnic Germans, some Serbs, some Bosnian Muslims, the Ustašas, etc. See Walter Manoschek, "'Gehst mit Juden erschossen?' Die Vernichtung der Juden in Serbien" in *Vernichtungskrieg. Verbrechen der Wehrmacht 1941–1944*, ed. Hannes Heer and Klaus Naumann (Hamburg: Hamburger Edition, 1995), pp. 39–56; Mark Mazower, "Militärische Gewalt und nationalsozialistische Werte. Die Wehrmacht in Griechenland 1941 bis 1944" in *Vernichtungskrieg. Verbrechen der Wehrmacht 1941–1944*, ed. Hannes Heer and Klaus Naumann (Hamburg: Hamburger Edition, 1995), pp. 157–190; Ben Shepherd, *Terror in the Balkans: German Armies and Partisan Warfare* (Cambridge, Massachusetts and London: Harvard University Press, 2012).

¹⁷ Valdis O. Lumans, *Himmler's Auxiliaries: The Volksdeutsche Mittelstelle and the German National Minorities of Europe, 1933–1945* (Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press, 1993).

¹⁸ Mariana Hausleitner, *Die Donauschwaben 1868–1948. Ihre Rolle im rumänischen und serbischen Banat* (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2014); Akiko Shimizu, *Die deutsche Okkupation des serbischen Banats 1941–1944 unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der deutschen Volksgruppe in Jugoslawien* (Münster: Lit Verlag, 2003); Ekkehard Völkl, *Der Westbanat 1941–1944. Die deutsche, die ungarische und andere Volksgruppen* (Munich: Rudolf Trofenik, 1991).