THE PERFECT OPPORTUNITY TO SHAPE NATIONAL SYMBOLS? AUSTRO-HUNGARIAN OCCUPATION REGIMES DURING THE FIRST WORLD WAR IN THE ADRIATIC AND THE BALKANS

Tamara SCHEER

Ludwig Boltzmann-Institute for Social Science History, Vienna
Wanriglgasse 4/2, 1160 Vienna, Austria
e-mail: scheer.tamara@gmx.at

ABSTRACT

Austria-Hungary incorporated parts of the Balkans and the Adriatic coast where it had long faced the Ottoman Empire only to have the Ottoman opposition replaced by Italy, Russia, and Serbia during the nineteenth century. Austria-Hungary occupied Montenegro as well as parts of Serbia and Albania during the First World War. In the occupied countries its army sought to counter enemy influence, especially that of Russia and Italy. In enemy states such as Serbia and Montenegro, Habsburg authorities introduced bans on some cultural symbols, including the Cyrillic alphabet. In Albania, which was classified as an occupied friendly state, the Habsburg occupiers supported Albanian culture to diminish Italian influence, including for example the changing of place names. The article shows that even when the occupier held administrative authority, measures it enacted could fail. The primary reason for failure was not purely political but lay rather in the fact that the measures endangered the smooth functioning of the occupation regimes's bureaucratic system.

Key words: Austria-Hungary, Occupation, First World War, Balkans, Nationalism

L'OCCASIONE IDEALE PER FORMARE SIMBOLI NAZIONALI? I REGIMI DI OCCUPAZIONE DELL'AUSTRIA-UNGHERIA NELL'AREA ADRIATICA E NEI BALCANI DURANTE LA PRIMA GUERRA MONDIALE.

SINTESI

L'Austria-Ungheria iniziò ad incorporare parti dei Balcani e della costa Adriatica dove a lungo si trovò a contrastare l'Impero Ottomano, per vedere poi l'opposizione degli Ottomani rimpiazzata dall'Italia, dalla Russia e dalla Serbia nel corso del XIX secolo. L'Austria-Ungheria occupò il Montenegro e parti della Serbia e dell'Albania durante la prima guerra mondiale. Nei territori occupati i suoi circoli militari dovettero contrastare l'influenza nemica, soprattutto quella della Russia e dell'Italia. Negli stati nemici come la Serbia e il Montenegro, le autorità asburgiche bandirono alcuni simboli culturali, tra

i quali l'alfabeto cirillico. In Albania, che fu classificata come uno stato occupato amico, gli occupatori asburgici promossero la cultura albanese per contrastare l'influenza italiana, anche con il cambiamento dei nomi dei luoghi. L'articolo dimostra che anche nel caso in cui l'occupatore abbia in mano l'autorità amministrativa, le misure che mette in atto possono non risultare efficaci. La ragione principale di tale fallimento non è solo di carattere politico, ma si basa soprattutto sull'incapacità di instaurare un regime di occupazione burocraticamente efficiente.

Parole chiave: Austria-Ungheria, occupazione, prima guerra mondiale, Balcani, nazionalismo

INTRODUCTION

"Eine ähnliche zwecklose Verletzung des kriegerischen Stolzes der serbischen Bevölkerung war die Abtragung des Monuments, das die Serben zur Erinnerung an die nationalen Einigungskriege und den Balkankrieg im Kalemegdanpark errichtet hatten. Die wenigen Zentner gewonnener Bronze der hohlgegossenen Figuren bedeuteten für die Mittelmächte trotz ihrer Rohstoffnot keinen wesentlichen Gewinn" (Kerchnawe, 1928, 66). [The dismantling of the monument that had stood in Kalemegdan Park to commemorate the wars of national unification and the Balkan Wars represents a comparably unprofitable violation of the Serbs' bellicose pride. The few hundred pounds of bronze that the hollow figures contained brought little benefit to the Central Powers despite their lack of raw material.]

Under the pretext of an urgent need for raw materials the Austro-Hungarian occupiers not only seized virtually all of Belgrade's church bells and doorknobs but also dismantled a famous national monument in Kalemegdan fortress park, one of the best-known sites in the Serbian capital. When Colonel Hugo Kerchnawe, one of the heads of the occupation regime, called it a "futile violation of the Serbian bellicose pride," he was surely thinking of the local population's reaction. This dismantling of cultural heritage, which constituted a violation of the Article 56 of the Hague Convention (Strupp, 1914, 126), helped foster animosity between the occupier and the occupied in Serbia. While the symbols of some occupied peoples were dismantled, however, the symbols of others were encouraged. This seemingly contradictory occupation policy reflected Austro-Hungarian foreign policy, its military goals, and its struggle to extend its cultural influence in the Balkans especially in the three countries occupied during the First World War: Albania, Montenegro, and Serbia.

The k.u.k. military leaders' arguments concerning this cultural war went in two directions. On the one hand, not only were some monuments dismantled and street names changed in Montenegro, Albania and Serbia, but the occupiers also attempted to remove the Cyrillic alphabet from public space entirely. While the Habsburg occupiers considered Cyrillic signs in Serbia to be Serbian and Russian national symbols and thus to be replaced, Italian influence competed with Albanian culture on the Adriatic coast. On the

other hand, the occupiers stressed the need to protect and support existing local culture against enemy influence in Albania, where local culture was declared to be in need of protection from Italian influence. This was also the case for Muslim Slavs, Albanians, and Turks in Serbia and Montenegro whose culture needed defending in the face of hostile Serbian (Russian) influence. While in Albania the occupiers propagated Albanian culture, no specific culture officially was propagated in Serbia and Montenegro. Although Serbia was an occupied enemy state and Albania an occupied friendly state in both countries similar changes in cultural heritage were made without consulting the population. In Serbia the conquerors chose to to replace enemy culture, while in Albania they declared their replacement of Italian culture to be protecting Albanian heritage and culture.

This article analyzes Habsburg occupation attempts to combat enemy influence by use of bans and forced changes in Montenegro, Serbia and Albania.[1] Some bans were unsuccessful and thus quickly retracted. Evidence reveals that although officials might have the status of "occupiers," they were not omnipotent. Occupation status was no guarantee of being able to make quick changes in daily cultural practice. Austria-Hungary had to withdraw its stipulations in the cases described below, not for political reasons but rather because the measures endangered the functioning of the occupation regime's bureaucratic system.

AUSTRIA-HUNGARY'S ENGAGEMENT WITH THE BALKANS AND EASTERN ADRIATIC IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY THROUGH 1914

Austria-Hungary had a long history of influence in the eastern Adriatic and the Balkans. Centuries of competition characterized this region; first with the Ottoman Empire, followed in the nineteenth century by Italy, and the newly emerged nation-states, Serbia-and its protector Russia--and Montenegro (Haselsteiner, 1996). Indeed, the Habsburg Monarchy was itself "Balkan." As a result of its incorporation of Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina, as well as parts of today's Montenegro and Serbia, Austria-Hungary's inhabitants included Croats, Serbs, Bosnians, and a handful Albanians. Moreover, domestic competition dominated the politics of the multiethnic Habsburg Monarchy. Historians have demonstrated that this ethnic struggle did not exclusively focus on opposing the imperial administration. They show that there was also competition among the various ethnic groups living in Dalmatia and the Upper Adriatic, for example, Italians against Slovenes and Croats. Other powers, like Italy intervened to shape the region's cultural and therefore political landscape (Wingfield, Klabjan, 2013; Reill, 2012; Cetnarowicz, 2008; Monzali, 2009; Klabjan, 2011). This power struggle, which took place before 1914 was always reflected in the Habsburg army. Indeed, the Habsburgs sometimes played an active role in cultural struggles (e.g. Monzali, 2009, 78).

In the years before the First World War, however, leading Habsburg military and civil figures became increasingly convinced of the "threats" certain ethnic groups posed. It

---

1 For this article I am employing sources from the military regimes as well as literature on the regimes that deal mainly with the civilian population. Especially the ban of Cyrillic was an important factor not only in historiography but in daily life for the population (e.g. Knežević, 2006; Mitrović, 2007).

was no longer clear to state authorities, for example, if Serbs singing traditional songs were simply living their culture or spreading Serbian nationalist ideas, as one staff officer reported to his superiors in Vienna.[2] Before 1914 Chief of General Staff Franz Conrad von Hötzendorf exercised great influence on the Monarchy's strategic planning and knew all the reports coming from the Balkans. He became convinced that Russia and Italy exercised a negative influence on the national attitudes of some peoples in that region of the Monarchy. Although in 1882 Italy had become part of the Austro-Hungarian-German alliance (together with Italy called the Triple Alliance), it still aimed to increase its influence in the Habsburg Adriatic provinces. Conrad thus argued for a preventive war against Italy. His beliefs led to his dismissal in 1911 as Chief of General Staff, although he was reappointed the following year. From this position, he would dominate Habsburg military policy during the First World War. He and hundreds of other officers experienced the threat of growing Italian national influence in "Italian" parts of the Habsburg Monarchy and Serbian/Russian influence in Southern Hungary, Bosnia-Herzegovina (from 1878 on) and the Sanjak of Novipazar (1879–1908) (Scheer, 2013). A Habsburg officer who was stationed in Trieste wrote in 1902: "Man hatte auch hier den Eindruck in Feindesland zu leben."[3] [One has the impression that he lives in enemy territory]. This attitude helps explain why, after military authorities had gained decisive power on political and administrative decisions owing to emergency laws put in place during the First World War, they sought to counter what they perceived as hostile domestic and foreign influences. These suppressive actions were especially directed against Serbian, Italian, Ruthenian, and Czech alleged anti-Habsburg efforts (Scheer, 2010).

Austria-Hungary was not only interested in countering the influence of the Russian and Italian enemy but had also long considered itself the protector of Christians living under Ottoman rule. Thus, throughout the nineteenth century Albanian Catholics had been given religious protection (Kultusprotektorat). The Austro-Hungarian government paid for priests' education, monasteries, and schools after the 1850s. Italian was the primary language taught to Albanians in Austrian schools because it was the lingua franca on the Adriatic coast. With the rise of Italian national influence and a growing irredentistism that sought to incorporate not only regions inhabited by Italophones into the newly created Italian nation state but also regions influenced by Italian culture, Austria-Hungary after the 1890s began propagating the slogan "Albania for Albanians." (Löhr, 2010, 27; Deusch, 2008, 6). In the Ottoman areas of the Balkans, Austria-Hungary and Italy participated in a sort of cultural arms race. When, for example, the Italians built a school with two classrooms, the Austrians built a larger one with four classrooms in view of the Italian school (Blumi, 2011; Fried, 2012). The Kultusprotektorat aimed to support Albanians Catholics in the Muslim Ottoman Empire but in the course of the late nineteenth century

---

2   ÖStA-HHStA, Konsulatsarchiv, Zivilkommissariat Plevlje, Kt. 3, Konv. Ausarbeitungen des Gen. Hptm. Oskar Melzer über das Vilajet Kosovo (1883) [Paper from Captain Oskar Melzer of the general staff on the Kossovo vilajet].

3   ÖStA-KA, Nachlasssammlung [NL], B/58, Nr. 4, August von Urbański. Das Tornisterkind (unveröffentlichtes Manuskript), 88.

through 1914 it was transformed to protect Albanians of all faiths from Italian cultural and political influence. The Habsburg-Italian cultural battle continued after the Balkan Wars of 1912 and 1913 when the principality of Albania was created and the Ottomans had been vanquished from the Balkans.

Although the Venetian Empire had disappeared from the map of Europe with the unification of Italy in 1871, Italian culture remained part of daily life in Albania and many Italians lived along the Habsburg Adriatic coast. Therefore, Italian-language geographic terms remained standard, and parents continued to give their children Italian names. As long as Austria-Hungary and the Kingdom of Italy were allied, relatively little official political attention was paid to this influence with the exception of Conrad's ongoing references to the Italian threat.

The Austrian Adriatic and the Habsburgs' southeastern provinces were for the most part calm at the turn of the century. There were almost no larger political efforts to counter Italian nationalist movements. The military was called in only infrequently to quell riots, that is, with the exception of Trieste in 1902 and the uprisings in the Krivošije near Kotor during the early 1880s. There had been no comparable efforts to "tame" nationalism, as Robin Okey has described in the case of neighboring Bosnia-Herzegovina (Okey, 2007). Although the entire Habsburg Adriatic could be called a "language frontier" – a region with a linguistically mixed population – it was not a point of political focus as were language frontiers in, for example, Bohemia or Northern Italy (Judson, 2006).

Nevertheless, Conrad was not the only military official to detect "hostile" cultural patterns in the region before the war. During earlier "crises," including the annexation crisis of 1908 and the First Balkan War, the Habsburg army had restricted cultural symbols through use of emergency regulations. Especially Serbs from southern Hungary and Bosnia-Herzegovina were affacted when the use of Cyrillic was restricted (Scheer, 2010).

AUSTRO-HUNGARIAN OCCUPATION POLICY

During the First World War Austro-Hungarian control of the Adriatic and the Balkans expanded. The Habsburg military occupied parts of Serbia during late autumn/winter 1915 (Bulgaria occupied the rest), Montenegro in January 1916, and northern Albania later the same year. While the occupier took over all political and administrative duties in Montenegro and Serbia, Albania was designated an occupied friend state. Thus, existing adminstrative heads remained in place and some Albanians were involved in decision-making processes and administration (Blumi, 2014; Scheer, 2009). Chief of General Staff Arthur Arz von Straußenburg, who had replaced Conrad in March 1917, sent the army commands' political principles for Albania to Foreign Minister Stephan Burián von Rajecz. These principles dated from September 1918 demonstrated that in some cases the occupation administration of Albania differed little from those in Montenegro and Serbia. Arz stipulated that South Slav propaganda was "unzulässig" [unacceptable]. The difference between Montenegrin/Serbian and Albanian occupation administration was reflected in the first point of the political principles: "Das Nationalgefühl der Albaner soll unbedingt geschont werden." [Albanian national feeling is to be carefully treated at all

costs] (Schwanke, 1982, 106). In Albania the occupier had an additional interest to support the local nationality. Montenegro and Serbia were treated differently. From the outset the occupation regimes combat Russian influence in Serbia, Italian influence in Albania, and the influence of both in Montenegro. In Serbia and Montenegro there was no official stipulation of which culture should replace the Serbian and Montenegrin. In documents dating from 1916 – a time when Serbia, Montenegro and Albanian were already occupied – lower-rank military officials proposed that Serbia be "croatized".[4] When the Hungarian prime minister István Tisza visited occupied Serbia in 1916, he opposed a process of croatiziation in Serbia and protested some of the measures taken there, including banning the Cyrillic alphabet.[5] Tisza's opposition much more resulted of a political interest to extend Hungarian influence in the Balkans then of a support of the Serbs (Scheer, 2009, 210).

It was long standard military practice that during occupation symbols deemed to be enemy expressions were removed and replaced with the occupier's symbols. These then dominated daily life (Scheer, 2011). Hillary Foottit has referred to "the power of naming," which foreign troops entering a country needed to "effectively occupy its space, imposing their own geography on what is to them a deeply unfamiliar territory." (Footitt, 2012, 7). In occupation regimes new names often depended on the occupier's future plans. For example, during the First World War the leaders of the Italian regime in Slovenia and the Bulgarian regime in Macedonia argued that they are ruling over their own realm; thus they planned to annex these territories. They therefore employed their hinterland's administrative structures and terms in occupied areas (Opfer, 2005; Svoljšak, 2012). The Habsburg occupiers did not make such an effort in Serbia, Montenegro or Albania although some leading figures, including Conrad, argued for annexation of some parts of Serbia and Albania.

Nevertheless, renaming processes owing to the Habsburg occupation did occur. Thus, when a Serbian or Montenegrin citizen walked through his hometown, soldiers in foreign uniforms passed him. Black-yellow flags with the double eagle replaced his own flag on administrative buildings. Inside public buildings Habsburg Emperor Francis Joseph and high Habsburg military authorities had replaced his monarchs. When he reached for matches because he wanted to have a smoke, there was now an Austrian double eagle on the matchbox.[6] Then the citizen had to ask someone for the time because the Austro-Hungarian administration had introduced daylight savings time, or as the local population noted, "naše vrijeme" (our time) and "vaše vrijeme," (their time) our time and their time (Wallisch, 1917, 95). The occupation regime also introduced left-hand side traffic on the streets as was standard in Austria-Hungary. Moreover, one of the occupation regime's first orders in January 1916 the military police renamed all those streets names in Belgrade which were considered "politisch bedenklich" (politically suspect). In the end,

---

4   ÖStA-HHStA, Politisches Archiv [PA] I, Kt. 975, Konv. Einzelne Verwaltungsmaßnahmen, Hptm d. R. Julius Ledinegg an AOK NA-Abt. , 24. 9. 1916.

5   ÖStA-HHStA, PA, Kt. 973, 32a, Serbien, Liasse Krieg, Vertreter des MdÄ in Serbien, Ludwig Graf Szechenyi, 18. 3. 1916, fol. 105f. Tisza also militated against the ban of Cyrillic in Bosnia-Herzegovina. He believed the ban only fanned the growing dissatisfaction among loyal inhabitants. (Juzbašić, 2002/03, 267).

6   ÖStA-KA, Neue Feldakten [NFA], Kt. 1590. Verordnung vom 20. 10. 1916.

police changed only 26 street names.[7] "Car Dušan Street" remained, as did Kral (king) Petar and Kraljica (queen) Natalija Streets.[8]

The Cyrillic alphabet was not only removed from public places in Serbia and Montenegro for political reasons (to counter Russian influence), but also because the occupier had few personnel who were able to read (or censor) it. The latter also served as excuse for bans on the language in the Habsburg lands. In Southern Hungary (today's Serbia) post office based censorship offices simply disposed of letters written with the Cyrillic alphabet for months, a procedure might have started at the beginning of the war. An investigation by the k.u.k. Kriegsüberwachungsamt (War Surveillance Office), which was responsible for the censorship, revealed in November 1914 a simple explanation for this incident: The outbreak of the war and the mobilization of a hundred thousands of men meant most post offices lacked sufficient skilled personnel to read Cyrillic. Post office officials therefore decided it was better simply to throw away the letters rather than risk the possibility of forwarding messages that might be directed against the Habsburg Monarchy or provide secret operational information to the enemy (Scheer, 2010, 97, Juzbašić, 2003/03, 267). The Habsburg military police in occupied Serbia commented the reason for elimination of street names rendered in Cyrillic: "Sämtliche Straßenbezeichnungen waren in cyrillischer Schrift gehalten, daher für uns zumeist vollkommen unverständlich," [All street names were in Cyrillic, which meant that they were a total mystery to us] in a report on their first months. There would have been also practical reasons for double inscriptions: Cyrillic and Latin side-by-side to give all pedestrians the possibility of reading them. This solution can be found too in the above- mentioned police report from July 1917, but only as an interim arrangement in Belgrade because the occupation policy aimed to replace all Cyrillic in public places.[9]

In addition to the sites behind the frontlines whose renaming had been authorized, Habsburg officers and enlisted men built a variety of commemorative sites, which they named for the most part after Austro-Hungarian military commanders. The soldiers also renamed fountains as well as buildings and streets. This unauthorized renaming continued under the occupation regimes. Superior commands opposed these actions and soon after the occupation an order came down to prevent such behavior. The orders stipulated that only the military general government could name new buildings. Moreover, those places that had already been renamed were to be reported. The only exception those new geographic names for which local communities were responsible. Nevertheless, under the pretext that community leaders had been assessed as hostile, the lower occupation authorities counseled local communities to avoid "willkürliche Änderungen oder unpassende Benennungen" [random changes or inappropriate naming], e.g. naming them for Russian or Serbian leaders.[10]

---

7   ÖStA-KA, Bildersammlung [BA], Erster Weltkrieg, Alben, Bd. 677. K.u.k. Militärpolizeikommando Belgrad 1915–1917, Kriegs-Ausstellung Wien, Juli 1917 [anlässlich „Ein Jahr Militärverwaltung in Serbien" [k.u.k. military police command Belgrade, War-Exhibition in Vienna](loose pages, unpaginated).
8   ÖStA-KA, Neue Feldakten [NFA], MGG S, Kt. 1629, Konv. MGG S Befehle 1917, Nr. 156, 26. 11. 1917.
9   ÖStA-KA, BA, Erster Weltkrieg, Alben, Bd. 677.
10 ÖStA-KA, NFA, Kt. 1689, MGG Montenegro, 1916. Verlautbarungen, 30. 11. 1916, Nr. 75.

The occupation regime also followed politically motivated efforts to eliminate Serbian and Russian symbols from public spaces. Images of current or former enemy monarchs and their families were forbidden: The Russian Tsar and the kings of Italy and Serbia were explicitly named in an order from May 1916. All existing pictures were to be removed but – as the order stated – "ohne Aufsehen zu erregen" [without causing sensation].[11] This order may have caused difficulties for the subordinate officers and soldiers charged with carrying it out. How were they to enter private buildings and remove pictures without being seen by the entire family and neighborhood? Praying for the king in the churches of Montenegro and Serbia with the argument with the argument that the Orthodox Church always had a close relationship with the nation state.[12] But as was the case of using Cyrillic letters, these bans were later eased or canceled altogether. While the ban for the praying for the Montenegrin king remained in effect, the use of pictures of the king and his family was permitted in public buildings and in private spaces.[13]

In Serbia the Gregorian calendar replaced the Julian, although the population was much more familiar with the former calendar. In diaries, for example, people often used both dates, referring to them as our and the other time (Knežević, 2006). The writer Friedrich Wallisch, who travelled through the occupied territories in official capacity, published a propagandist book on the occupation regime's achievements in 1917. Referring to a regulation based on an Army High Command common regulation valid for Serbia and Montenegro, Wallisch wrote that despite the change of the calendar, church holy days had remained on the same date. He commented: "Man schont dabei Stimmungen und Traditionen" [With these regulations we respect mood and tradition] (Wallisch, 1917, 95; Verordnungsblätter, 8. 5. 1916).

On the other side another "futile violation of bellicose pride" that Kerchnawe commented on concerning the removal of the monument in Belgrade, occurred. Soon after the Austro-Hungarian army occupied Montenegro, the military general governor ordered the removal of the remains of the Montenegrin Prince Petar II/Petrović Njegoš from his tomb on Mount Lovćen, because the occupiers had classified the tomb as a "feindliches Nationalsymbol" [enemy national symbol]. Another reason was that the occupiers planned to fortify this tactical important point. The action caused international debate on the Austro-Hungarian occupation policy. Gustav Ritter von Hubka, who had been the pre-war military attache in the Montenegrin capital, Cetinje, and was later chief of staff of the military government in Montenegro, wrote "Der Schwarzen Berge letzter Gospodar. Eine Streifschrift zur Ehrenrettung König Nikolaus I. von Montenegro" [The last prince of Montenegro. A paper to save the honor of King Nikolas I of Montenegro] in 1947. In this article he quoted an Italian journalist who asserted that the tomb caused "in Wien mehr Argwohn und mehr Verdruss auslöste, als die Truppen des [montenegrinischen] Königs Nikolaus" [caused more anger in Vienna than King Nicholas' army]. Although the metropolitan bishop had vetoed their removal, the King's remains were taken to a monastery in Cetinje. Hubka concluded: "Dieses Vorgehen löste bei der Bevölkerung

11   ÖStA-KA, NFA, 14. 5. 1916.
12   ÖStA-KA, NFA, Kt. 1628, MGG Serbien, Fasz. Priština, 3. 1. 1915.
13   HL, II. 468., k.u.k. MGG M, Kt. 1, Konv. Közlemények 1–86, Verlautbarung, Pkt. 13, 14. 5. 1916.

große Bestürzung aus." [This action caused great consternation among the population.] (Hubka, 1947, 50).

COMBATING ENEMY CULTURAL INFLUENCE

These measures as well as the following very often lacked a grand strategy, although some of them were similar to the pre war, war and crisis planning (i.p. against Serb nationalism). None of these measures analyzed above caused so much international uproar as did the attempt to ban the use of the Cyrillic alphabet in Montenegro and Serbia. The occupiers initially sought the alphabet's ban throughout the occupied areas because military decision makers considered it the strongest symbol linking the occupied peoples to Serbian nationalism and Russian policy.[14] The occupier soon recognized, however, that in practice elimination of the alphabet was hard to achieve. Literacy was low in Serbia and those who were literate read Cyrillic. Thus the Cyrillic alphabet was not completely forbidden, but as the "Allgemeine Grundzüge" (the "constitution" of the occupation governments) stated: it had to be "auf jenes Maß beschränkt werden, das nach dem praktischen Bedürfnisse unbedingt erforderlich war" [restricted to a degree that is inevitabely necessary for daily practice] (Jungerth, 1918, 12). In February 1916 the government ordered subordinate offices to encourage older people to learn the Latin alphabet.[15] But they did not offer any suggestion how to put this order into practice.

The Austro-Hungarian occupation regimes brought a broad bureaucratic system into Montenegro and Serbia which required reading knowledge. Almost everyone – literate or not – had to apply for passports when he or she wished to travel to another town. When peasants' crops were requisitioned, they received requisition receipts for their goods, which they were obliged to take to the occupation office for reimbursement. The military governor of Montenegro ignored the writing and reading skills of the population. He gave an order in April 1916 that permitted the use of only the Latin alphabet in correspondence with Austro-Hungarian offices. He provided the reason for this request: „Der Gebrauch der Cyrillica durch die Bevölkerung erschwert infolge Unkenntnis dieser Schrift seitens der k.u.k. Kommanden unnötig den Dienstbetrieb und verzögert daher die Erledigung der Bitten und Beschwerden der Bürger." [The population's use of Cyrillic causes delays owing to a lack of knowledge on the side of the military commands in answering their requests and complaints] (Kundmachungen, 1916, 15. 4. 1916).[16] The archival documents do not indicate how this appeal was addressed to the population by the occupier. Very likely that it was – as it was practice in April 1916– posted on the buildings' walls or published in newspapers – and used only the Latin alphabet.

---

14 Stjepan Sarkotić, the governor of Bosnia-Herzegovina with Croatian origin, propagated Cyrillic as an enemy symbol ("the alphabet of a hostile foreign country") (Juzbašić, 2002/03, 269).

15 ÖStA-KA, Armeeoberkommando [AOK], Qu. Abt., MGG S, Kt. 2379, Fasz. Militärverwaltung. Akt Nr. 18312, 24. 2. 1916.

16 The handling of administrative correspondence in terms of accepting or rejecting documents written with the Cyrillic alphabet was also discussed in Bosnia-Herzegovina from 1878 onwards. All in all, correspondence employing the Cyrillic alphabet had been accepted. (Juzbašić, 2002/03, 247).

The desire for the occupation regime's bureaucratic system to function smoothly was then an important reason why the ban of Cyrillic was soon softened. The first "Allgemeine Grundzüge für die Militärverwaltung in Serbien" from January 1916 do not mention the Cyrillic alphabet, perhaps because the occupier had not expected any further discussion on the use of alphabets The experience from the first months of occupation induced the occupiers to publish new regulations in April. In the new version the occupation forces restricted themselves in the favor of the population: "Der Bescheid an die Partei ist jedoch in diesen Fällen gleichlautend in lateinischer und cyrillischer Schrift auszufertigen". [In correspondence with the population the Latin and Cyrillic alphabet must be used in the same way]. This passage was removed from the third edition of the Grundzüge of September 1916. (Allgemeine Grundzüge, September 1916, 10). No cause for the deletion was mentioned, but again, perhaps it owed to a lack of skilled personnel – a situation which increased monthly But the population was "still" permitted to send letters to the Austro-Hungarian commands in Cyrillic (Jungerth, 1918, 12).The ban was finally annuled for practical reasons: the need to communicate with the population more efficiently, despite the fact that the Habsburg occupiers lacked sufficient personel who could read Cyrillic. As consequence Serbs and Montenegrin had to wait much longer for an answer. Bureaucracy slowed down.

When Serbian schools re-opened in spring 1916 after the occupation teachers came mostly from the Habsburg lands (not only Serbs but also Croats, Slovenes, and others with Slav language knowledge). They employed the Latin alphabet, with which they were familiar, to teach. At the beginning of the occupation Latin became the only alphabet permitted.[17] Although Cyrillic-language text books had been in use in the Habsburg lands, they could not be imported into occupied Serbia because it was forbidden to use them.[18] Thus until the occupation regime ended schools in Serbia and Montenegro lacked sufficient school books. Milovan Đilas, who later became a Yugoslav politician and writer, was a young schoolboy during the occupation of Montenegro. In „Land ohne Recht" [Land without justice], Đilas wrote about his early education: „Mein Schulbuch trug den bescheidenen Titel: Fibel für die Volksschule. Die Fibel enthielt nur Buchstaben in lateinischer Schrift. Insgeheim lehrten uns jedoch die älteren Schüler aus alten Büchern das cyrillische Alphabet. Unser Lehrer, der wie wir Hunger litt, wusste es, er übersah es geflissentlich. Die Lateinschriftfibel und das Kaiserbild an der Wand blieben nicht die einzigen Einbrüche der brodelnden politischen Situation." [My school book was titled: Book for the Primary School. Only the Latin alphabet was used. Older boys secretly taught us Cyrillic using old school books. The teacher, who was starving as we were, ignored this. The books with the Latin alphabet and the picture of the emperor on the wall were not the only expressions of the seething political situation] (Djilas, 1958, 88).

17 ÖStA-KA, AOK, 24. 2. 1916.

18 During occupation of Bosnia-Herzegovina, there was ongoing discussion about how to restrict the use of the Cyrillic alphabet and to limit it to religious classes and secondary schools. The Cyrillic alphabet was not only forbidden in the schools of the occupied countries, but also in Croatia at the end of 1914 (Juzbašić, 2002/03, 248, 264).

Fig. 1: Classroom in occupied Serbia. On the right Emperor Francis Joseph looks down on the children, while a little girl is writing majka, otac, brat [mother, father, brother] on the blackboard using the Latin alphabet; Source: ÖStA-KA, Bildersammlung, Serbien, Kt. 22, Nr. 3425, Schule Loznica, während des Unterrichts, I. und II. Klasse, Mädchen.

Young Đilas's teacher was an Austro-Hungarian Unteroffizier or (non-commissioned officer, NCO) who was perhaps aware of the occupation policy. The Armeeoberkommando (army high command, AOK) feared that a too strict ban would provide cause for hostile reaction from the local population,[19] and thus found a compromise for the schools. Cyrillic was implemented as an academic subject so students could read religious books.[20] On July 24, 1916 the occupation regime ordered that the school instructions be given only in the Latin alphabet, but old Slavic Cyrillic was to be taught in the course on Greek-Orthodox religion. (Verordnungs-Blatt, 24. 7. 1916).

In the beginning the use of the Cyrillic alphabet was forbidden or restrictedboth in schools and in bureaucratic communication. An AOK instruction from May 5, 1916 allowed publishing in Cyrillic only with the permission of the military government. It also required that orders of the occupation authorities had to be printed in Cyrillic and in Latin alphabet and posted in public (Verordnungsblatt, 5. 5. 1916). In November 1917 the oc-

---

19   ÖStA-KA, AOK, Akt Nr. 18312, 1916.
20   ÖStA-HHStA, PA I, Kt. 974, Liasse Serbien, MGG S an AOK 24. 8. 1918.

cupation government promoted its annual calendar, which was printed in German, Hungarian, and Serbo-Croation with the comment that all calendars were printed in Gregorian and Julian style, the latter in Cyrillic, which was also used in some parts of the instructive and entertaining texts.[21]

The above examples demonstrate that while the occupier held civil and military authority over the local population and had the political will to limit enemy culture, it faced intractable opposition that forced the occupation regime to abandon some of its measures piecemeal. The main reason for the abandonment was not purely political but rather that the measures endangered the smooth functioning of the occupation regime's bureaucracy. The regime also feared a growing resistance of the population. In the end, it was not the enemy culture that disappeared but the rigid stipulations of the occupation regime's first weeks.

SUPPORTING NATIONAL SYMBOLS

Efforts to remove Italian geographic place names on the Adriatic coast were not limited to Albania but were also made in Montenegro and Dalmatia. In mid-1916 the AOK ordered all subordinate commands in Dalmatia to employ Croat rather than Italian place names in internal and external correspondence, for example, Zadar instead of Zara, and Šibenik instead of Sebenico, and Kotor instead of Cattaro. To avoid "Unstimmigkeiten oder Reibungen" [inconsistency and friction] use of the older term in brackets would be permitted until July 1917 (HL, 31. 7. 1916). Former Habsburg officers who employed Italian place names in their memoirs reflect this policy's lack of effectiveness. For example, Joseph Stürkgh, who served as an officer in the Balkans used Spalato instead of Split. (Stürgkh, 1922, 40). He was not alone.

Military interest was not the sole reason for the renaming. In 1916 the Balkan commission of the Austrian Academy of Sciences was invited to a meeting in Vienna of the Commission for the Dalmatian Toponomy (place names) ("Kommission für Ortsnamen in Dalmatien").[22] That the academic interest in place names in the Balkans and East Adriatic predated the war is shown by the case of Professor Peter Skok who worked as school teacher in Banja Luka and later became a linguist at the University in Zagreb. He had already requested toponomy research on the Venetian influence on Dalmatian toponomy in 1912.[23] Following Skok other scientists went to Albania for expeditions by Austria-Hungary. Other scientists from the Austrian Academy of Sciences soon realized that they could travel to Albania under the auspices of the army soon after its occupation in January 1916. Geologists, botanists, art historians, ethnologists, archeologists, and linguists

---

21 ÖStA-KA, NFA, MGG S, Kt. 1628, Fasz. Militärgeneralkommando-Befehle. Befehl Nr. 150, 14. 11. 1917.

22 AÖAW, Balkan-Kommission, Kt. 1: Konv. A4, Einladung der Balkan-Kommission zur Kommission für die Ortsnamen in Dalmatien etc. am 16. 11. 1916 [Invitation for the Balkan Committee from the Committee for Geographical Terms in Dalmatia]; Marchetti, 2013.

23 AÖAW, Konv. C1. The Croatian linguist Petar Skok was born in 1881 in the Slovene lands in a small village near Žumberak. He was a language teacher in Banja Luka before the First World War and later taught at the University of Zagreb.

travelled throughout the Balkans with official permission and under the guidance and surveillance of the military (Kerchnawe, 1928, 301–302). Among other activities, they "rescued" Albanian artistic work that was to be used for an Albanian national museum after the war (Schwanke, 1982, 473).

The treatment of Italian names of Dalmatian towns was replicated in Albanian towns. In March 1916 Habsburg occupation forces ordered that henceforth all geographic terms as well as "tribal" names no longer be rendered in Italian but rather the German translation of the Albanian term was to be used. A list containing both the old and the new names was to be published. The older term would be permitted in brackets. Only a few months after Charles succeeded Francis Joseph as Habsburg emperor in 1916, he withdrew the orders on place names and commanded that the earlier toponymy be re-introduced for the occupied countries.[24] When in the beginning the Italian version Scutari was no longer to be used, but rather Schkodra, and Vlora instead of Valona (see Fig. 2) then Schkodra was again designated "Skutari," the German version of the Italian name.[25]

K. u. k. Armeeoberkommando.		Beilage.
Zu K. Nr. 5514.		
Italienische Bezeichnung	Albanesischer Name	Deutsche Umschreibung
Scutari	Shkodĕr-dra	Schkodra
San Giovanni di Medua	Sh'njin-i	Schenjin
Bojana	Bunĕ-na	Buna
Alessio	Lesh-i	Lesch
Dulcigno	Ulquin-i	Ultschin
Durazzo	Durc-i	Durz
Sasso bianco	Shkâmb i Durc-it	Schkamb (Felsen) v. Durz
Valona	Vlorĕ-ra	Vlora
Saseno	Sasani	Sasan
Klementi	Kelmend-i	Kelmend
Ipek (türkisch)	Pejĕ-ja	Peja

Fig. 2: ÖStA-KA, NFA, Kt. 1628, MGG, 28. 3. 1916.

---

24   HL, II. 468., kuk MGG M, Kt. 1, Konv. Közlemények 1–86, Verlautbarungen Nr. 82 des MGG M, 20. 12. 1916.
25   ÖStA-KA, Kt. 1628, MGG Serbien, Fasz. oranger Ordner, MGG Befehl Nr. 11, 27. 1. 1917.

The Habsburg officer Georg Veith introduced his official report on the Habsburg Albanian campaign with a comment on the Austrian self-conception of the Albanian occupation. He wrote that "man war als Freund und Befreier ins Land gekommen" [we came as friends and liberators]. In a report Veith wrote after the First World War on the military experience in Albania he claimed that Albanians helped to "cleanse" the country of former occupiers by which he meant the Italians. Veith continued that the same should happen to Italian "Kulturspuren" [cultural traces] in order to foster Albanian independence.[26]

Habsburg support of Albanian culture in Albania started immediately after the occupation. The opposite happened in Montenegro and Serbia where Albanians also lived. In September 1916, almost nine months after the implementation of the military government, the civil commissioner of Mitrovica (today Kosovska Mitrovica in Kosovo), Julius Ledinegg, reported to the intelligence branch of the AOK on the Habsburg occupation policy in "New Serbia." He described the occupiers' attitude towards the southern Serbian regions as "Feindesland" [enemy territory], which were not considered "former Turkish provinces."[27] Ledinegg claimed that the population of the former Turkish provinces should be treated like Albania: as occupied friends. His claim reflected the attitude of many Habsburg officers for whom these regions were an integral part of the Ottoman Empire although Montenegro and Serbia had conquered them during the First Balkan War (1912). Many occupation officers knew the former Sanjak region because they had served until 1908 with the Habsburg military. They had experienced the Muslim population as friendly and supportive and regretted the outcome of the First Balkan War (Scheer, 2013). Ledinegg appealed for a more supportive atittude toward the Albanian and Muslim population that had backed the Austro-Hungarian troops during the recent fighting. He argued against the ongoing "Croatization" of Serbia, a policy that military authorities had pursued during the first months of occupation, but abandoned during summer 1916. Ledinegg also appealed for Albanian- rather than Croatian-language schools for Albanian speakers in Serbia.[28]

Military authorities in Vienna declared the occupation regime in Serbia a success solely because it was a source of raw material and labor for the Monarchy. The "land of king killers had become the land of milk and honey" as the historian Jonathan Gumz notes (Gumz, 2009, 3). The military leaders did not discuss intensively the outcomes of such a policy, or the degree to which the Serbs and Montenegrins had been negatively influenced by such a supportive policy of their minorities.

---

26 HL, Manuskripte/TGY Jegyzek, Nr. 544, Veith György, Der Feldzug in Albanien 1916–1918 [The Albanian Campaign], 22.

27 ÖStA-HHStA, PA I, Kt. 975, Konv. Einzelne Verwaltungsmaßnahmen, Hptm d. R. Julius Ledinegg an AOK NA-Abt. , 24. 9. 1916.

28 ÖStA-HHStA, PA, 24.9.1916; HL, Personalia, Kt. 161, Suhay Imre, Tagebuch Nr. 5, 15. 4. 1917; ÖStA-HHStA, PA, 18. 3. 1916.

CONCLUSION

Habsburg measures to counteract enemy cultural influence in the occupied Balkan states proved toothless from the outset. Occupation measures sharply restricted the respective population's ability to cultivate cultural symbols, when they had been identified as "enemy." But there were practical reasons why these measures were fleeting. Certainly occupation authorities even employed the forbidden Cyrillic alphabet in their own announcements to guarantee that the local population could understand them. Although Italian place names had been forbidden in Albania, Montenegro, and the Dalmatinian Coast they remained more popularly used than their Croatian or Albanian equivalents.

Austria-Hungary only occupied Albania, Montenegro, and Serbia for some two and a half years, too brief a period to implement long-term political change. These examples show, however, that domestic politics influenced occupation policy. Many measures the military introduced under Francis Joseph were retracted after his death in November 1916 by his successor, Charles. Another reason for the retraction of suppressive measures was that they had threatened the smooth functioning of the bureaucracy of the occupation regimes.

POPOLNA PRILOŽNOST ZA OBLIKOVANJE NACIONALNIH SIMBOLOV?
AVSTRO-OGRSKI OKUPACIJSKI REŽIMI MED PRVO SVETOVNO VOJNO
NA JADRANU IN BALKANU

Tamara SCHEER
Inštitut Ludwiga Boltzmanna za zgodovino družbenih ved na Dunaju
Wanriglgasse 4/2, 1160 Dunaj, Avstrija
e-naslov: scheer.tamara@gmx.at

POVZETEK

Avstro-Ogrska je vključevala velike dele Balkana in Jadranske obale. Skupaj z Italijo, Rusijo, Črno goro in Srbijo je postopoma izrinila vpliv Otomanskega cesarstva v jugovzhodni Evropi. Med prvo svetovno vojno je habsburška vojska čedalje bolj širila svoj vpliv tako v notranjih zadevah s širjenjem izrednih razmer kot na vojaškem področju z zasedbo delov Albanije, Črne gore in Srbije.

Članek analizira avstro-ogrska vojaška prizadevanja na okupiranih ozemljih v odziv na sovražne kulturne vplive – predvsem Rusije in Italije. V okupiranih sovražnih deželah, kakršni sta bili Srbija in Črna gora, si je habsburška vojska prizadevala za odpravo

kulturnih simbolov. V Albaniji, ki je bila označena kot okupirana prijateljska država, so se habsburški okupatorji proti italijanskemu vplivu poskušali boriti tako, da so podpirali albansko kulturo. Njihovi ukrepi so vključevali prepoved uporabe cirilice v šolah in v javnosti v Srbiji in Črni gori ter spreminjanje imen mest, zamenjavo in odstranjevanje spomenikov v vseh treh državah.

Članek ponazarja, da lahko celo okupacijski sili, ki ima upravna pooblastila, uvedeni ukrepi spodletijo. Avstro-Ogrska je morala v treh spodaj analiziranih primerih preklicati svoje odloke v obeh sovražnih okupiranih državah in v Albaniji. Glavni razlog za preklic ni bil enoznačno političen, temveč so ukrepi ogrožali gladko delovanje birokratskega sistema okupacijskega režima.

Ključne besede: Avstro-Ogrska, okupacija, prva svetovna vojna, Balkan, nacionalizem

SOURCES AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

AÖAW – Archiv der Österr. Akademie der Wissenschaften.

HL – Hadtörténelmi Levéltár Budapest.

Kundmachungen – Kundmachungen und Verlautbarungen des k.u.k. Militär-General-Gouvernements in Montenegro in der Zeit von 1. März bis 31. Oktober 1916. Cetinje 1916.

ÖStA-HHStA – Österreichisches Staatsarchiv. Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchiv.

ÖStA-KA – Österreichisches Staatsarchiv. Kriegsarchiv.

Verordnungsblätter – Verordnungsblätter der k.u.k. Militärverwaltung in Montenegro, 19. Mai 1916 – 9. 9. 1918.

Verordnungs-Blatt - Verordnungs-Blatt der k.u.k. Militärverwaltung in Serbien, 22. 3. 1916 – 31. 12. 1916.

Reichsgesetzblatt - Staatsgrundgesetz vom 21. Dezember 1867 über die allgemeinen Rechte der Staatsbürger für die im Reichsrate vertretenen Königreiche und Länder. In: Reichsgesetzblatt, Nr. 142/1867.

Blumi, Isa: Albania, in: 1914–1918-online. International Encyclopedia of the First World War, ed. by Ute Daniel, Peter Gatrell, Oliver Janz, Heather Jones, Jennifer Keene, Alan Kramer, and Bill Nasson, issued by Freie Universität Berlin, Berlin 2014-10-08. DOI: 10.15463/ie1418.10197 Last modified: 2014-10-13.

Blumi, I. (2011): Reinstating the Ottomans. Alternative Balkan Modernities, 1800–1912. New York, Palgrave.

Cetnarowicz, A. (2008): Die Nationalbewegung in Dalmatien im 19. Jahrhundert. Vom "Slawentum" zur modernen kroatischen und serbischen Nationalidee. Frankfurt, Peter Lang.

Deutsch, E. (2008): Das österreichisch(-ungarische) Kulturprotektorat im albanischen Siedlungsgebiet. IDM Kulturführer, 2008, 4–6.

Djilas, M. (1958): Land ohne Recht. Köln, Kiepenheuer & Witsch.

Footitt, H. (2012): Introduction. Languages and the Military: Alliances, Occupation and Peace Building. In: Footitt, H., Kelly, M. (eds.): Languages and the Military: Alliances, Occupation and Peace Building. Basingstoke, Palgrave, 1–11.

Fried, M.B. (2012): The Cornerstone of Balkan Power Projection. Austro-Hungarian War Aims and the Problem of Albanian Neutrality, 1914–1918. Diplomacy & Statecraft, 23. 3. 2012.

Gumz, J. E. (2009): The Resurrection and Collapse of Empire in Habsburg Serbia, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Haselsteiner, H. (1996): Bosnien-Hercegovina: Orientkrise und Südslavische Frage (= Buchreihe des Instituts für den Donauraum und Mitteleuropa 3). Vienna, Böhlau.

Hubka von Czernczitz, G. (1947): Der Schwarzen Berge letzter Gospodar. Eine Streifschrift zur Ehrenrettung König Nikolaus I. von Montenegro. Vienna. (unveröff. handschriftl. Manuskript (ÖStA/NL, B/61:1–18, Nr. 10).

Judson, P. (2006): Guardians of the Nation. Activists on the Language Frontiers of Imperial Austria, Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press.

Jungerth, M. (1918): Entstehung und Organisation des k.u.k. MGG für Serbien. Belgrade, [s.n.].

Juzbašić, D. (2002/2003): Die Sprachenpolitik der österreichisch-ungarischen Verwaltung und die nationalen Verhältnisse in Bosnien-Herzegowina, 1878–1918. Südost-Forschungen, 61/62, 235–272.

Kerchnawe, H. (1928): Die k.u.k. Militärverwaltung in Serbien. In: Kerchnawe, H. (ed.): Die Militärverwaltung in den von den österreichisch-ungarischen Truppen besetzten Gebieten (= Carnegie-Stiftung für internationalen Frieden, Abteilung Volkswirtschaft und Geschichte). Vienna, Hölder-Pichler-Tempsky, 53–269.

Kerchnawe, H. (1928): Die Militärverwaltung in Montenegro und Albanien. In: Kerchnawe, H. (ed.): Die Militärverwaltung in den von den österreichisch-ungarischen Truppen besetzten Gebieten (= Carnegie-Stiftung für internationalen Frieden, Abteilung Volkswirtschaft und Geschichte). Vienna, Hölder-Pichler-Tempsky, 270–304.

Klabjan, B. (2011): "Scramble for Adria." Discourses of Appropriation of the Adriatic Space before and after World War I. Austrian History Yearbook, 42, 16–32.

Knežević, J. (2006): The Austro-Hungarian Occupation of Belgrade during the First World War: Battles at the Home Front. Phil. Diss. Yale.

Kraus, K. (1957): Die letzten Tage der Menschheit. Munich, Kösel.

Löhr, H.C. (2010): Die Gründung Albaniens: Wilhelm zu Wied und die Balkan-Diplomatie der Großmächte 1912–1914. Frankfurt, Lang.

Marchetti, Ch. (2013): Balkanexpedition. Die Kriegserfahrung der österreichischen Volkskunde – eine historisch-ethnographische Erkundung (=Untersuchungen des

Ludwig Uhland-Instituts der Universität Tübingen, Bd. 112). Tübingen, Tübinger Vereinigung für Volkskunde.

Mitrović, A. (2007): Serbia's Great War 1914−1918. West Lafayette, Ind., Purdue University Press.

Monzali, L. (2009): The Italians of Dalmatia. From Italian Unification to World War I. Toronto, University of Toronto Press.

Okey, R. (2007): Taming Balkan Nationalism. The Habsburg "Civilizing Mission" in Bosnia, 1878–1914. Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Opfer, B. (2005): Im Schatten des Krieges. Besatzung oder Anschluss – Befreiung oder Unterdrückung? Eine komparative Untersuchung über die bulgarische Herrschaft in Vardar-Makedonien 1915–1918 und 1941–1944. Studien zur Geschichte, Kultur und Gesellschaft Südosteuropas 3. Munich, Lit Verlag.

Reill, D. Kirchner (2012): Nationalists Who Feared the Nation. Adriatic Multi-nationalism in Habsburg Dalmatia, Trieste and Venice. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Scheer T. (2013): "Minimale Kosten, absolut kein Blut!": Österreich-Ungarns Präsenz im Sandžak von Novipazar (1879–1908). Neue Forschungen zur ostmittel- und südosteuropäischen Geschichte 5. Frankfurt et al., Lang.

Scheer, T. (2011): Manifestation österreichisch-ungarischer Besatzungsmacht in Belgrad (1916–1918). In: Angelow, J. (ed.): Der Erste Weltkrieg auf dem Balkan. Perspektiven der Forschung. Berlin, Bebra, 211–239.

Scheer, T. (2010): Die Ringstraßenfront – Österreich-Ungarn, das Kriegsüberwachungsamt und der Ausnahmezustand während des Ersten Weltkriegs. Schriftenreihe des Heeresgeschichtlichen Museums 15. Vienna, Heeresgeschichtliches Museum.

Scheer, T. (2009): Zwischen Front und Heimat: Österreich-Ungarns Militärverwaltungen im Ersten Weltkrieg. Neue Forschungen zur ostmittel- und südosteuropäischen Geschichte 2. Frankfurt, Peter Lang Verlag.

Schwanke, H. (1982): Zur Geschichte der österreichisch-ungarischen Militärverwaltung in Albanien. Univ. Diss. Vienna.

Strupp, K. (1914): Das Internationale Landkriegsrecht. Frankfurt am Main, Baer.

Svoljšak, P. (2012): The Language Policy of the Italian Army in the Occupied Slovenian Territories, 1915–17. In: Footitt, H., Kelly, M. (eds.): Languages and the Military: Alliances, Occupation and Peace Building. Basingstoke, Palgrave, 70–85.

Stürgkh, J. (1922): Politische und Militärische Erinnerungen. Leipzig, List.

Wallisch, F. (1917): Die Pforte zum Orient: Unser Friedenswerk in Serbien. Vienna, Tyrolia.

Wingfield, N. M., Klabjan, B. (2013): Introduction to forum on Continuity and Change in South-Central Europe, 1914–1920. Acta Histriae, 21, 4, 729–734.