with Greece, Bulgaria, Albania and Romania, he summarizes the impact of migration on these societies in the dynamic period of nation-building and border changes. Using Peggy Levitt’s concept of transnational village, he argues that “Southeastern Europe is a transnational village on a large scale”. The relevance of migration for the region is both from the diachronic and from the synchronic perspective. Choosing the region of Southeastern Europe as “a perfect laboratory for migration studies research”, the author offers a detailed analysis of migration and its social, political and economic dimensions for “home” societies. Observing migration and its long-term consequences for such societies, Brunnbauer’s book provides a new transnational perspective on migration and the role of the nation-state in building “diasporas” across the Atlantic. Including Southeastern Europe in a much larger context of global migration history, Globalizing Southeastern Europe is a pioneering work and a valuable case study in the modern history of immigration into the United States.


*Reviewed by Anja Nikolić*

John Paul Newman, lecturer in Twentieth-century European History at Maynooth University, states in the “Preface” to his Yugoslavia in the Shadow of War. Veterans and the Limits of State Building 1903–1945 that “this book is a study of consequences of the Great War on the people who fought it and on the states to which they returned once the fighting was over”. Newman’s main focus is on interwar Yugoslavia, which he has chosen because it “was formed in the aftermath of a protracted period of conflict during which many of its subjects had been mobilized in opposition to each other” (p. 2). He further explains that there were in interwar Yugoslavia tens of thousands of men that had served in the Serbian army and also tens of thousands of men that had been soldiers of the Austro-Hungarian army. The author centres his book on patriotic organizations and veterans’ associations, and the story of them is used in describing “the downfall of liberal state”. As the author himself puts it, “this book uses Yugoslavia as a case study in how and why liberal institutions, installed throughout the new states of central and eastern Europe at the end of the war, collapsed almost uniformly in the years after 1918”. A second important topic for the author is the remobilization of South-Slav war veterans in the Second World War. Newman is aware that only a minority of those who had served and fought in the Great War returned to the battlefield in 1941. However, he argues that “those that did played a pivotal role in the establishment and ideological organization of groups contested the civil war in Yugoslavia from 1941 to 1945” (p. 3). He finds it important to explain the motivations behind the decision of former Austro-Hungarian officers of Croat descent to make an important contribution to the programme of the Croatian fascist Ustasha movement. In the same context Newman writes about “nationalist veterans of Serbia’s wars from 1912 to 1918” who “would radically restate their nationalizing agenda in the “Yugoslav Army in the Homeland […] after 1941”. Putting them in the same context completely misses the point of the two phenomena.

* PhD student, Department of History, Faculty of Philosophy, University of Belgrade
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Newman points out two important phenomena for interwar veterans’ organizations in Europe and in Yugoslavia – “cultural demobilization” and the political role of veterans’ organizations. The phenomenon of “cultural demobilization” led to the birth of a “culture of victory” and a “culture of defeat”. While Great Britain and France cultivated the “culture of victory” which celebrated the achievements and sacrifices of their soldiers in the First World War, countries such as Austria, Germany and Hungary had the “culture of defeat”, which insisted on revisionism. The author claims that the “culture of victory” was an integral part of the diplomatic agenda of the states that emerged as successors of Austria-Hungary, such as Romania, Poland, Czechoslovakia and – Yugoslavia. Newman describes that the largest number of war veterans in Yugoslavia came from the Serbian army and “that the Yugoslav culture of victory was based on achievements of Serbian army that liberated South Slavs from imperial rule and unified them into a common state at the end of the war”.

For the author, the central position accorded to Serbian army veterans marginalized Austro-Hungarian army veterans and caused clefs. For the author, the story told in his book is the story “of a state formed in the rubble of a conflict which pitted its subjects against one another, a state whose national institutions were too fragile to carry out the necessary work of post-war reconstruction and reconciliation, especially in regard to former soldiers of both the Entente and the Central Powers” (p. 17).

John Paul Newman’s book consists of eight chapters preceded by a preface and an introduction. It is structured into three main parts. In the first part, which comprises chapters 1, 2 and 3, the author seeks to explain the clash between the civil and military authorities in Serbia which culminated in the “Salonika Trial”. He is also focused on the establishment of patriotic and veterans’ organizations in the 1920s, particularly on the Association of Reserve Officers and Warriors and the National Defence. Newman is aware of the complexity of their position as they were trying to reconcile Serbian and Austro-Hungarian veterans. The celebration of the Serbian army and its victories that had led to liberation and unification was very difficult to reconcile with veterans that had fought in the army of the Dual Monarchy. The last chapter of the first part of the book is titled “Resurrecting Lazar” and, according to the author, it “analyzes the ‘medievalization’ of Serbia’s war victory in the ‘southern territories’ of Kosovo and Macedonia, lands which were newly associated with Serbia after 1918”. For Newman, Kosovo and Macedonia are “the so-called ‘classical south’ of Serbia”. Both regions were, according to him, put under the process aimed to “impress a Serbian character upon them” (p. 82) even though the author himself admits that “much of Serbia’s ecclesiastical heritage was located here” (p. 83). In this chapter, Newman focuses on the role of veterans, especially Chetniks, in the programme of internal colonization, the fight against “a-national” elements, and the founding of national institutions. He pays some attention to charitable and humanitarian organizations, especially those that organized welfare for disabled war veterans and orphans; but it seems unnecessary and out of context to insist that The Circle of Serbian Sisters, a humanitarian organization, did not take part in the battle for women’s suffrage (p. 91).

The second part of the book also comprises three chapters. It is focused on Austro-Hungarian veterans and their way of remembering the war. Newman claims that Austro-Hungarian veterans of South-Slav origin were perceived as a single homogeneous group which belonged to the defeated enemy, whereas in reality they were divided amongst themselves as they had vastly different experience of serving under the Habsburg eagle. The author’s contention that the veterans of the Dual Monarchy were marginalized in the Serbian-dominated
Yugoslav army is debatable. Another topic discussed in this part of the book concerns patriotic and paramilitary organizations which consisted of veterans but also of members of the “war youth generation”. Newman discusses in detail the Organization of Yugoslav Nationalists (ORJUNA) and its extremism and violence. He also writes about the Serbian Nationalist Youth (SRNAO) but fails to mention the Croatian National Youth (HANAO). He describes the conflict between ORJUNA and SRNAO seeking to point out its importance in the creation of the atmosphere of violence in Yugoslavia, but the reader cannot find a single word about the no less important conflict between ORJUNA and HANAO.

The third part of the book consists of two chapters and it addresses individuals and organizations mentioned in the first two parts now on the eve of and during the Second World War. While reading the first two parts of this book, one may notice some imbalance in the author’s approach to violence in interwar Yugoslavia and identification of those responsible for it. This last part of the book shows a marked lack of even-handedness. Newman’s account of the Second World War on Yugoslav soil is a biased one. He discusses the Nedić state, the Chetniks and their leader Dragoljub Mihailović, the Ustasha, and the Partisans. The author tries to explain that the Chetniks tried to “maintain the culture of victory” and that “this course seemed like the logical continuation of the battles that had been fought by Serbia during the years 1912–1918” (p. 250). Newman claims that “violence against non-Serb, which was characteristic of the Chetniks’ fighting” (p. 251) had a political goal in sight – “an expanded and unified Serbia”. He insists on violence against non-Serbs while describing the Nedić state, and yet, while writing about the Independent State of Croatia (NDH) and the Ustasha regime, he fails to mention the Jasenovac concentration camp or, for that matter, any other concentration camp formed on NDH soil. Newman observes that the Ustasha regime brought “a pleasing change of fortunes for many former Austro-Hungarian officers” (p. 256). Even though he provides examples of former Austro-Hungarian officers joining the fascist Ustasha regime, he states that the Ustasha programme was far too radical for former officers of the Dual Monarchy and that the study of their role has had mixed results.

Tremendous amount of archival research was done in preparation for writing this book. Newman researched his subject in the Archives of Yugoslavia, the Croatian State Archives, and the Archives of the Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts. It should be noted, however, that the literature used lacks some relevant more recent titles. This book has its faults, but it offers an important study into veterans’ organizations and paramilitary violence during the interwar period.


Reviewed by Miloš Vojinović*

The Great War, with its aftermath, stands as the beginning of many narratives depicting the history of the contemporary world. Looked at from the European perspective, it was, in the words of Ian Kershaw, the beginning of the continent’s trip “To Hell and Back”. Charles de Gaulle’s claim that it was just the first episode of a second European Thirty Years’ War has found many followers.

* Institute for Balkan Studies SASA