

Review Paper

UDC: 341.322.5(497.11)"1941"

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.16811813>

Received: 25 April 2025

Accepted: 20 May 2025

**Radomir S. Popović\***

MoD of Republic of Serbia

## POLITICAL VIOLENCE IN OCCUPIED KRALJEVO IN 1941

### ABSTRACT

*The topic of the research paper before you is the application of the phenomenon of political violence by using repressive measures during military occupation in wartime conditions, shown on the example of the City of Kraljevo during the occupation of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia by the Third Reich, or Nazi Germany, during World War II in the war year of 1941. Through the events that led to the massacre in the City of Kraljevo, some of the repressive measures that were carried out by members of the regular army units of Nazi Germany - the Wehrmacht, which as a subject represented a mechanism for carrying out reprisals against the population of the City of Kraljevo and its immediate surroundings, as well as the processes that took place in the social, economic and political life of the affected and surviving population and the impact that the crimes had on the population of the city and its surroundings, as well as on the socio-political processes in society both during the events themselves and in the future that reaches the present with a brief review of the consequences that the above-mentioned phenomena left on the collective socio-political consciousness "among the Serbs".*

**Keywords:** Political violence, Occupations, repressive measures, Kraljevo, Massacre.

---

\* E-mail: [radomir.b.popovic@gmail.com](mailto:radomir.b.popovic@gmail.com)

## POLITICAL VIOLENCE – A THEORETICAL REVIEW

In the social sciences, the terminological definition of concepts can often be incomplete or inconsistent. The reason for this is found in different understandings of the same concepts, poor translation from the languages from which these concepts originate, and even because some international entities do not like a specific concept to be precisely defined, so that they can avoid legal mechanisms while practicing what the concept represents. Among the most famous concepts that simply do not have a generally accepted definition, but only generally accepted elements, is the concept of terrorism (Sami, 2004, pp. 491-492).

Political violence is one of the central concepts, or key concepts, within political science, security and sociological research. It involves the use of force or the threat of force to achieve political goals, whether it is to preserve the existing political order, to violently change it, or to challenge the legitimacy of government. Political violence most often occurs in the context of social conflicts, revolutions, wars, terrorist acts, state repression or civil unrest.

As a social phenomenon, political violence manifests itself as an application with the purpose of achieving political interest, often outside the institutional, legal and democratic framework. In this sense, political violence is not in itself the result of a spontaneous drive for destruction, but a deliberate instrument in the hands of actors who act with a specific purpose (Simeunović, 2009, pp. 118-120). Ted Robert Gurr, in his book "Why Men Rebel", develops the concept of relative deprivation, according to which people resort to violence when they feel that there is a disparity between what they believe they deserve and what they actually have. This emotionally personified sense of injustice often serves as a driving force for collective rebellions and violent revolutions (Gurr, 2015, pp. 3-5).

Martha Crinshaw believes that political violence is a rational choice – an instrument that actors use when they assess that there are no effective

nonviolent ways to achieve political goals. On the other hand, Johan Galtung broadens the concept of violence by introducing the concepts of structural and cultural violence, which refer to social and institutional arrangements that produce and maintain inequality and oppression, even when there is no direct physical aggression (Galtung, 1969, pp. 167-191).

These different theoretical models allow for a deeper analysis of the phenomenon of political violence, both in historical and specific local contexts. In this paper, they will serve as a basis for interpreting the violence that marked the period of occupation of Kraljevo in 1941, especially in the context of repressive measures and massacres carried out by the Nazi occupier in order to consolidate control over the population.

### Basic concepts of political violence

“Power, authority, force and violence are among the central concepts of politics” (Simeunović, 2009, p. 99) and it is precisely as such that we must briefly and individually define them approximately.

**Power** - The concept of power in political theory is often defined as the ability of one actor to impose his will on another, even in the face of resistance. Max Weber defines power as follows: “Power means any chance of an individual or group to implement its will within a social bond, even against resistance”. Power can be exercised through various resources – economic, informational, military, cultural – but its essence is the ability to influence the behavior of others.

**Force** - is one of the instruments of power, but it refers exclusively to the physical application of coercion. While power can also be symbolic or psychological, force implies direct action, often involving the use of weapons, physical threats, or imprisonment. According to Hannah Arendt: “Force is by its nature instrumental; like every tool, it is justified by its end” (Arendt, 1970, pp. 36-38). However, Arendt emphasizes that authority and force are

not the same thing – authority is based on legitimacy and acceptance, while force implies coercion and fear.

**Authority** - represents an institutionalized form of power, i.e., legitimate power that is exercised within a political system. Unlike “naked” violence, authority implies acceptance by subjects, whether out of habit, belief in the legitimacy of the system, or fear. Weber distinguishes three types of legitimate authority: traditional, charismatic, and rational-legal (Weber, 1978, p. 53).

**Violence** - is defined as the intentional use of physical force or power, whether threatened or actual, against others, that either results in injury, death, psychological harm, social injustice or structural discrimination. According to the World Health Organization: “Violence is the intentional use of physical force or power... that either results in or has a high likelihood of resulting in injury, death, psychological harm or developmental impairment” (Report, 2002, p. 5). In a political context, violence is most often considered an illegitimate or extreme form of political action, although in authoritarian and totalitarian regimes it often becomes institutionalized and perceived as “legal.”

However, even the aforementioned political concepts of power, force, authority and violence are not properly defined by the generally accepted definition, but largely depend on the needs of the person who interprets these concepts and their needs to justify some phenomenon in society as legitimate. In the course of investigating the phenomenon of political violence, it is still necessary to select some definitions, the elements of which could be used to conduct a case study and give some concrete conclusions. The above definitions are stated to represent guidelines with the help of which it is possible to draw a conclusion, and as an element of objectivity, the definitions were taken from authors from different periods, countries, professions and ways of publishing.

## **A BRIEF OVERVIEW OF THE FORMS OF POLITICAL VIOLENCE BY NAZI GERMANY AND ITS ALLIES**

### **A brief overview of the Second World War and the April War of 1941**

During the thirties of the 20th century, there was a trend of growing tensions and preparations for a new global conflict that would abolish the Versailles order, and the rapid growth of tensions can be seen especially after the Nazis came to power in Germany in 1933. The economic crisis and the extremely high dissatisfaction of the German people with the Versailles peace agreement helped Adolf Hitler to come to power and establish a totalitarian government, by the way violating the provisions of the peace agreement by militarizing the Rhine region, but also by recruiting young men for the army with a decree calling on young men born in 1914 to serve in the military (Nađ, 1971, p. 54).

Relying on the idea of “living space” (Lebensraum, German) for the Aryan race, the Anschluss of Austria was carried out in 1938, as well as the annexation of the Sudetenland in Czechoslovakia. The international community tried to curb Hitler’s ambitions, but all attempts were in vain, that is, the policy of “appeasement” was limited to short periods of time, which is especially evident in the example of the attack on Czechoslovakia in 1939, when it was divided.

At the same time, the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact was concluded, which divided Germany and the Soviet Union into spheres of interest in Eastern Europe. The attack on Poland on September 1, 1939 started the Second World War. Germany soon followed the invasions of France, Norway, the Netherlands, Yugoslavia and other countries.

Within Germany, enemies of the regime were identified through ethnic, cultural and ideological categories: Jews, Communists and Slavs. The adoption of racial ideology led to an increase in public support for violence, which symbolically began with the event known as “Kristallnacht” in 1938 — the beginning of the political persecution of Jews and the prelude to the

Holocaust. The entire Czech Republic fell to Germany, while Slovakia became a puppet state of Nazi Germany.

The position of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia before the Second World War was extremely unfavorable. The signing of the Triple Pact by the Cvetković-Maček government on March 25, 1941 caused mass dissatisfaction among citizens, which culminated in a coup d'état on March 27. The military coup, led by General Dušan Simović, led to the abolition of the Viceroyalty and the declaration of King Peter II as an adult, thereby canceling the accession to the Pact.

Hitler responded to this by invading without declaring war. The April War began on Easter, April 6, and the capitulation of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia followed on April 17. According to Miodrag Zečević, the military apparatus of the Kingdom mobilized only a third of the reserve composition, which, along with the overwhelming superiority of the Axis powers, led to a rapid collapse (Zečević, 1994, p. 70).

After the end of the war, the country was divided: the Independent State of Croatia (NDH) was formed, puppet structures in Slovenia and Montenegro, and the Military Administration under General Milan Nedić was established in central Serbia. Already in the first months of the occupation, the NDH initiated terror against the Serbian population. According to the Ustasha policy, a third of the Serbs were to be killed, a third converted to Catholicism, and a third expelled — the ideologue Mile Budak formulated this doctrine, the implementation of which began already in the summer of 1941.

At the same time, two anti-fascist movements were formed in Serbia - the Yugoslav Army in the Fatherland, under Colonel Dragoljub Draža Mihailović, and the National Liberation Movement (which would later grow into the National Liberation Army), under the leadership of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia.

On the resistance actions of these two anti-fascist movements, the occupier carries out mass reprisals according to the principle of "one hundred for one", which leads to tragedies such as the massacres in Kraljevo and Kragujevac.

### **A brief overview of the forms of political violence by Nazi Germany and its allies**

An example of political violence towards an individual or a group is represented by the measures that Nazi Germany introduced in the territories it controlled (directly or through puppet governments) against the population that is not Germanic, that is, that does not belong to the Aryan race as the ideology of Nazism preached. The victims of this ideology were collectively people of Slavic, Roma and Jewish culture/religious affiliation, as well as members of “accepted” groups who did not agree with politics, with the fact that a distinction was even made between members of Slavic culture depending on religion. The Slavs who belonged to the Western Christian churches did not suffer atrocities to the same extent as their ethno-cultural relatives who performed rituals according to the teachings of the Eastern churches, that is, who were of the Orthodox faith. Of course, to some extent, the difference in treatment between Slavs of two different Christian philosophies (Western versus Eastern) was also influenced by the geopolitical position of the country they were from.

There are many different examples such as Poland (concentration of the occupation authorities on the persecution of the Jewish population, as well as those groups they considered unsuitable (Jataks, democrats, communists, members of the upper classes) by building systems of concentration camps like Auschwitz, then the Czech Republic (occupied but was spared major crimes due to its physical-geographic proximity, great Germanic influence in the area, but also to a large extent because it was previously left without the Sudetenland after the Munich Agreement 1938), Slovakia, which became a puppet state under the direct control of Berlin, while Bulgaria and Hungary, for example, were allies of the Triple Pact and avoided such forms of political violence, and as a counter example we have Romania, which was forced to hand over parts of its sovereign territories to Hungary (Transylvania, Eastern and Northern, as well as Romanian Dobruja). allies, is already under ceded the territories of Bessarabia and Bukovina to the Soviet Union under the threat of force, with the support of the German ambassador.

## THE SITUATION IN THE OCCUPIED KINGDOM OF YUGOSLAVIA AFTER THE APRIL WAR

The short-lived April War ended with the capitulation of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia. The hostilities themselves ended with the "Provisions on the implementation of the armistice between the German and Yugoslav armed forces, which established the necessary elements for the surrender of military equipment, equipment and personnel of the Yugoslav army. Members of the Yugoslav army were taken into German captivity, but this only applied to members of the Serbian nationality from the territory of Serbia and Montenegro (1994, p. 71).

Those who managed to avoid capture and escape, returned mostly to their places of birth with the aim of organizing themselves for an armed struggle against the occupiers. The population of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia was not spared. Depending on the national and religious affiliation, there were different degrees of political violence that the peoples within the young kingdom suffered.

During and after the end of the April War, the political process of dividing the territory of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia began, "first on April 10, 1941, the "Independent State of Croatia" was formed from the territories of the Banovina of Croatia, the former Vrbaska and parts of the Banovina of Danube and Drina. The rest of the country was divided into quisling territories that were under the patronage of mainly Germany and Italy. In the area of pre-Cuman Serbia, a Military Administration was created, headed by General Milan Nedic, from 1941 to 1944, along with the already mentioned Montenegro, while in Slovenia we have a quisling government under the protectorate of fascist Italy (1994, p. 93).

Croats, that is, the political elite from the Croatian nation to whom Nazi Germany gave the keys to power, chose to be the apparatus of political violence in the tragedy of the Second World War. After the April War, Ante Pavelić and the Ustasha clerofascist movement entered the political scene



in Croatia. After the occupation of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia, Nazi Germany divided it into occupation zones between its allies and itself, but still, in order not to waste too much political power, it created a puppet quasi-state called “Independent State of Croatia” headed by Anto Pavelić, whose ideological core was the Ustasha ideology. Such a quasi-state creation was nothing more than an instrument to carry out a brutal form of political violence against the non-Croat population in a certain area.

The Slovenes came under the direct control of Berlin after the April War, and the political violence that was perpetrated was only perpetrated against those who openly advocated resistance or preparation for resistance, as well as members of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia or members of the Yugoslav Army in the Fatherland. However, for the purposes of this work, it should also be noted that families who represented a possible threat to the Third Reich were internally displaced to the Military Administration of Serbia, and Kraljevo received a part of those refugee waves.

Muslims, that is today’s Bosniaks, had a somewhat different status. They were seen as a potential shock weapon, similar to what Nazi Germany was trying to make of Turkey, and mostly under the direct control of the NDH created SS divisions and recruited volunteers to fill regular units. This of course applies to the political elite who were given executive power, while many originally sided with the regular army of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia, and later joined the Partisan or Chetnik resistance movement. Prominent people like Tuzla mufti Šefket Efendi Kurt, used their political power and influence to stop mass crimes against their fellow citizens.

The population of Macedonia, divided between Greater Albania (the name for the fascist puppet state under the control of the Kingdom of Italy, whose king was the Italian King Emmanuel II) and the Kingdom of Bulgaria, was subject to repressive measures depending on their ethnic and religious identity. The massive Slavic Orthodox population was forcibly assimilated into Bulgarian. The Bulgarian Exarchate usurped the jurisdiction of the Serbian Orthodox Church and its autonomy.

Serbs, along with Jews and Roma, were mostly victims of political violence, almost wherever they happened to be in the Kingdom of Yugoslavia. They are victims of repressive measures in all occupation zones. Massacres and genocide were committed against them in the NDH. The Serbs were labeled as unfit and had to be dealt with, because they were the only group that openly and organizedly stood up against Nazi Germany in the Kingdom of Yugoslavia (parts of the regular army whose members were Serbs did not surrender without a fight and both resistance movements were initially almost entirely made up of Serbs), and were seen as a disruptive factor by the Nazi regime in Berlin.

In the struggle to maintain political power in Kraljevo, the occupying power will introduce repressive measures as a means of deterring the insurgents from further actions, but as such a measure fails, the occupying forces, motivated by revenge, will massacre the population of Kraljevo.

Muslims, that is today's Bosniaks, had a slightly different status. They were seen as a potential shock weapon, similar to what Nazi Germany was trying to make of Turkey, and mostly under the direct control of the NDH created SS divisions and recruited volunteers to fill regular units. This of course applies to the political elite who were given executive power, while many originally sided with the regular army of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia, and later joined the Partisan or Chetnik resistance movement. Prominent people like Tuzla mufti Shefket Effendi Kurt, used their political power and influence to stop mass crimes against their fellow citizens.

The population of Macedonia, divided between Greater Albania (the name for the fascist puppet state under the control of the Kingdom of Italy, whose king was the Italian King Emmanuel II) and the Kingdom of Bulgaria, was subject to repressive measures depending on their ethnic and religious identity. The massive Slavic Orthodox population was forcibly assimilated into Bulgarian. The Bulgarian Exarchate usurped the jurisdiction of the Serbian Orthodox Church and its autonomy.

Serbs, along with Jews and Roma, were mostly victims of political violence, almost wherever they happened to be in the Kingdom of Yugoslavia. They are victims of repressive measures in all occupation zones. Massacres and genocide were committed against them in the NDH. The Serbs were labeled as unfit and had to be dealt with, because they were the only group that openly and organizedly stood up against Nazi Germany in the Kingdom of Yugoslavia (parts of the regular army whose members were Serbs did not surrender without a fight and both resistance movements were initially almost entirely made up of Serbs), and were seen as a disruptive factor by the Nazi regime in Berlin.

In the struggle to maintain political power in Kraljevo, the occupying power will introduce repressive measures as a means of deterring the insurgents from further actions, but as such a measure fails, the occupying forces, motivated by revenge, will massacre the population of Kraljevo.

### **The beginning of resistance - Uprising in 1941**

Historically speaking, the Serbian people have repeatedly raised uprisings against foreign occupiers and tyranny. Ever since the struggles against the Ottoman Empire and Austro-Hungarian domination, until the First and Second Serbian Uprisings, resistance has largely become the political culture of the Serbian people. As one of the more significant examples close in time to the Second World War is certainly the Toplica Uprising from 1917, and we can even compare it to a certain extent, taking into account that it was raised under similar circumstances.

In this continuity, the uprising of 1941 gets a special place, because it was initiated by two ideologically opposing movements: the Yugoslavs and the communists. Although they would later become rivals, in the initial phase they acted together in the fight against the Nazi occupier.

The symbolic beginning of the uprising is linked to an event in the village of Bela Crkva on July 7, 1941, when members of Žikica Jovanović's partisan

company attacked the gendarmerie. This event was later celebrated as Uprising Day in Serbia.

On the other hand, members of the Yugoslav Army carried out a significant action in the homeland of Lieutenant Colonel Veselin Misita on August 31, 1941, when they captured 93 German soldiers in Loznica. Although Lieutenant Colonel Misita was soon killed, this action represents one of the first major victories of the Serbian resistance against the Wehrmacht.

### **The strategic importance of the City of Kraljevo**

As a city, Kraljevo had strategic importance in terms of infrastructural, military-industrial, and traffic-transportation, which we must briefly review.

The city occupied the area of the confluence of the Ibar River with Zapadna Morava and Ribnica with the Ibar River. In the military sense, the strategic importance of this area is also confirmed by the medieval fortress Maglič. This fort was the central object that, after the invasion of the Bulgarians and Cumans and the relocation of the state and the Archbishopric to Pec, defended the roads to Kosovo, Metohija, Macedonia, as well as the approaches to Studenica, Đurđev stupi and Ras. The same was associated with positions in Brevnik, Galič and Zvečan. After falling under Ottoman rule, the fortress was also used by the Turks (it retained its military-administrative importance) and had a permanent crew. This area gained additional importance after the Peace of Požarevac in 1718 and the establishment of the Austrian-Turkish border along Western Morava, where Karanovac assumed the military-strategic role of Maglič, which would later be reflected and enlarged during the First Serbian Uprising after the Battle of Karanovac.

In the 19th century, the military-strategic importance of this area was increased by building new roads, infrastructural facilities (bridges, roads, hospitals), changing the administrative-administrative role, while in the 20th century, it became a smaller industrial center with an aircraft factory, a

railway workshop for the repair of wagons and locomotives (later the wagon factory), and even by 1941, Kraljevo became the largest construction site in Serbia with several “colonies” of foreign citizens, among which the French colony is best known for (Dražković, 2016, pp. 14-17).

After the Balkan Wars and the First World War, the city of Kraljevo lost a lot in economic and demographic terms. Although it had its economic potential, the City of Kraljevo represented part of the bad financial picture that the delegation of the Kingdom of SHS handed over to the Reparations Commission for the assessment of the situation in terms of material and other damage caused by war destruction. During the 19th century, a factory of agricultural implements (the first commercial enterprise) was founded, as well as several modern mills, the city entered the First World War with three enterprises. The industrial boom followed in the interwar period, the use of forests and natural resources in terms of the wood processing industry, the leather industry (the leather processing workshop of Živko Antonijević in Ribnica), and two brick-making facilities.

However, the data on the first modern factories of the City of Kraljevo presented a true representation of the industrial potential.

The first such was the “Aircraft Factory”, founded in 1927, which was one of the most modern factories of its time and represented the foundation of the industrialization of the city, the production license was purchased from the Anonymous Society of Aviation Workshops “Louis Breguet” from France. As French technology was being replaced by German technology, the contract was signed with the company “Dornier” according to a similar principle as with the French company. The “Aeronautical Technical Institute” was also moved to Kraljevo in August 1927. Another important factory was the “Wagon Factory”, exceptionally due to its geographical and communication location, embodied in the railway hub of crossed tracks on the Belgrade-Skopje, Niš-Sarajevo and Niš-Dubrovnik routes. It was considered one of the largest railway workshops in Europe (Virijević, 2006).

From all of the above, it can be concluded that the city was of extremely great logistical importance for the Wehrmacht and that as such it represented one of several strategic locations in the Kingdom of Yugoslavia where the power of Nazi Germany had to be maintained in order to fulfill the war operations.

### **The occupation regime in Kraljevo**

The city of Kraljevo, during the occupation, was part of the Military Administration of Serbia — a zone under the direct control of Nazi Germany. Although there was a puppet government structure in the form of the National Salvation Government of General Milan Nedić, the real control was the German military administration, directly subordinate to the Wehrmacht and Berlin. Local self-government, like the municipal government in Kraljevo, had limited powers and served mainly as the executive body of the occupiers.

After the entry of the 60th Motorized Division into the city, executive power is taken over by the division's rear commander, who soon restores the activities of the gendarmerie and the police. The municipal administration continues to work with the existing president Dušan Krstić, but under the strict supervision of the German command (Ortskomandantura I/833) (Nikolić, 2003, pp. 47-48).

During the summer and autumn of 1941, Kraljevo became an important logistical hub. The Wehrmacht deploys infantry, artillery and armored units to ensure the transport of troops and resources to the Eastern Front. The garrison in the city included the headquarters and units of the 749th Regiment, as well as parts of the 514th Regiment of the 294th Division. Although relatively weak in the first months, the garrison gets stronger over time. Nevertheless, due to the involvement of units in the battles in Čačak, Loznica and Kruševac, in early October 1941, the operational weakening of the German forces in Kraljevo took place.

This circumstance allowed the insurgents to close the ring around the city on October 4. In addition to military activities, the city also received refugees from other parts of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia, although the exact number for the first year of the war remains unknown, due to incomplete documentation (Krejaković, 2003, p.73).

### **The battle for the liberation of Kraljevo**

The uprising in Serbia in 1941 was initiated by two resistance movements - the communist (National Liberation Army of Yugoslavia) under the leadership of Josip Broz Tito, and the royalist (Yugoslav Army in the Motherland - JVuO) led by Colonel Dragoljub Draža Mihailović. Although with a common goal - the liberation of the country - their starting point of view was opposite.

The members of the communist movement strove for a revolutionary change in society, while the members of the Yugoslav Army in their homeland defended the monarchical order and the return of King Peter II Karađorđević. The initial period of resistance to the occupier was marked by cooperation between the two sides, but ideological and tactical differences led to a split.

In July and August 1941, successful insurgent actions began throughout Serbia. Loznica was liberated on August 31 by the Yugoslav Army in the homeland, and resistance movements are conquering other territories as well. The German command responds by appointing General Franz Boehme as the head of the executive power and passing an order on drastic measures: for every killed German – 100 Serbs, for every wounded – 50.

Kraljevo, as an important logistics center, became the target of the insurgent action. At the beginning of October 1941, the insurgents closed the ring around the city. The first attacks began on October 9 near the Žiča monastery. The German command reacts with repression, shooting 70 people in the village of Vitanovac.

However, during the battle for Kraljevo itself, cooperation between the two movements broke down. Contradictory versions exist on both sides: the Yugoslav Army in the homeland claim that they were left without support at a crucial moment, while NOP members believe that they were attacked in other regions by JVuO. The fighting for Kraljevo reached its peak in mid-October 1941, but without coordination, the insurgents failed to liberate the city. Mass reprisals against the civilian population followed.

This conflict marked the beginning of the civil war and the end of the common front. The ideological division deepened, and the consequences are felt to this day. Historical narratives were long dominated by one side, until the breakup of Yugoslavia in the 1990s, when a broader insight into both perspectives was made possible.

### **Presentation of political violence in the occupied Kraljevo in October 1941**

The basic measure which was specifically applied and which will be discussed in this paper was created, that is, it is justified by an order contrary to international legal norms, which was valid in all occupied territories by the Third Reich. Such established rule was applied to a lesser or greater extent, and on the territory of the Military Administration in Serbia it was remembered as “100 Serbs for one killed German, 50 Serbs for one wounded German” (Rummel, 1994, pp. 31-43).

Specifically for the City of Kraljevo, the Orders that pointed the barrels of weapons of Wehrmacht units at civilians were valid based on the order of the higher command (recorded under No. 2848/41 in the Headquarters of the Plenipotentiary Commanding General in Serbia), General Franz Boehme was explicit in his order of October 10, 1941 regarding the implementation of mass reprisals: “Should there be losses among German soldiers or Volksdeutsche, the territorial authorities commanders, up to and including



regimental commanders, will immediately order the shooting of the enemy according to the following rates:

- 1) In garrisons, local commanders are responsible for arrests.
- 2) For every killed German soldier or Volksdeutsche 100 prisoners or hostages.
- 3) 50 prisoners for each wounded person. The shooting will be done by the troops. (Krejaković, 2013).

After the closing of the ring around the City of Kraljevo and the beginning of the insurrectionary activities in October 1941, the German occupying forces launched a massive reprisal against the civilian population. In order to preserve military and political control, i.e. power, they implement a series of repressive measures which, according to author Silvija Krejaković, can be classified as different forms of political violence, according to the following:

**1. Repressive administrative violence:** Immediately after the start of the attack, the occupier introduces movement bans, the obligation to report to the police, and night raids become especially frequent. These measures precede mass arrests and are aimed at preemptively suppressing any insurgent activity. Also, these measures were followed by the suspension of local government, as well as the subsequent appointment of local officials who had little to no decision-making power.

**2. Systemic ethnic and ideological violence:** Arrests and deportations to camps were not carried out based on individual responsibility, but on ethnic and political affiliation - communists, nationalists, Jews, Roma, democrats and intelligentsia. The orders implied a quantitative norm, not personal guilt.

**3. Physical violence - mass execution:** Retribution according to the "100 for one" and "50 for the wounded" scheme resulted in a massacre in which, according to various sources, between 2,000 and 6,000 people were shot. According to official German reports, over 2,000 detainees were killed on

October 15 and 16 alone. Workers of the Aircraft Factory, railroad workers and youth suffered the most.

**4. Psychological violence / violence against individual and group consciousness:** Threats to shoot entire families if the radios are not handed over, bans on going out even to the yard, shooting at children - all this points to violence aimed at paralyzing the collective spirit. Testimonies, such as Marko Slomović's testimony about digging his own graves, document the extreme degree of psychological terror.

**5. Cultural-social violence:** The massacre left lasting effects in the collective consciousness. Estimates of the number of victims vary, and fragmented documents and testimonies speak of a deliberate cover-up. Although the Museum in Kraljevo has a list of up to 2,000 identified executed persons, estimates reach as high as 6,000. This form of violence continues in the realm of collective memory (2013, pp. 41-75).

Despite six attempts to stop the shooting — from ultimatums by partisans and local government delegations, to the mediation of Saint Bishop Nikolay — none of the initiatives produced the desired result before October 20, when the reprisals were suspended. Behind the massacre remains not only a large number of victims, but also a permanent division in the historical and collective memory of the Serbian people.

In this tragedy, entire families disappeared, while the occupier used excavators and lime to plow the place where the Massacre took place in order to remove traces of the crime. When the families learned about the tragedy of their loved ones, they raised a black flag, which flew over almost every house in Kraljevo (2013, p. 51).

As one of the key questions that must be investigated is "How many victims of the massacre in Kraljevo were there in October 1941?" It is a tragic fact that even today, the number of victims of the Kraljevac massacre is quoted as ranging from 2,000 to 6,000 people (Glišić, 2003, p. 22), while according to the records that contain names, surnames and other personal data, it is possible

to speak of a number of slightly more than 2,200 people (Krejaković, 2013, pp. 107-235), which coincides with German sources (Glišić, 1970, p. 64).

Based on the collected material, Dr. Koča Jončić in his work "Kraljevo okobar in 1941" presented data that between 14,000 and 15,000 permanent residents lived in Kraljevo and its surroundings, along with about 2,500 to 3,000 refugees from different parts of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia, from which it follows that the total number of inhabitants was between 16,500 and 18,000. Taking into account the way in which the occupier shot the population (100:1, 50:1), he assumed that there were between 3,000 and 3,500 people (Jončić, 1971).

## CONCLUSION

Precisely in order to preserve the authority and power on the territory of the occupied City of Kraljevo as an extremely important military-strategic and industrial point in the Kingdom of Yugoslavia, the occupier as a political subject created the conditions for extremely repressive measures and the use of force, the consequence of which was an extremely high degree of politically motivated violence against the Serbian and other population in the area of the city, with which he managed to preserve control over the city.

The investigation of political violence in occupied Kraljevo during 1941 shows a complex interaction between institutionalized force, ideological repression and tragic consequences, i.e. a complex network of factors that lead to the application of mass repressive measures against the civilian population.

Because of its position, as well as the actions of the insurgents on its territory, Kraljevo became the epicenter of German reprisals aimed at preserving political and military control over the territory, at a time when the growth of the insurgent movement threatened the occupation order.

In a theoretical sense, by applying the aforementioned models of political violence from the beginning of this paper, it is clear that the violence that was

carried out in Kraljevo was a classic example of political repression with the aim of suppressing and preventing the uprising.

Repressive measures, such as mass arrests, curfews, ideological and ethnic segregation, mass shootings, and psychological terror, represent various forms of political violence.

## REFERENCES

- Arendt H. (1970). *On Violence*. Harcourt Brace.
- Dražković D. (2016). *Kraljevo od varoši do grada*. [Kraljevo from town to city] Narodni muzej Kraljevo. Kraljevo.
- Galtung J. (1969). "Violence, Peace, and Peace Research", *Journal of Peace Research*, Vol. 6, No. 3.
- Glišić V. (1970). *Teror i zločini nacističke Nemačke u Srbiji 1941–1944*, [Terror and crimes of Nazi Germany in Serbia 1941-1944]. Beograd.
- Glišić V. (2003). "Još jednom o velikom ratnom zločinu u Kraljevu 1941. godine." [Once again about the great war crime in Kraljevo in 1941]. *Kraljevo, oktobra 1941. godine*. Narodni muzej Kraljevo.
- Gurr R. (2015). *Why Men Rebel*. Taylor & Francis.
- Jončić K. (1971). *Kraljevački oktobar 1941. godine*. [October 1941 in Kraljevo]. Ekonomska politika i Kulturno-prosvetna zajednica Kraljeva.
- Krejaković S. (2003). „Kraljevo oktobra 1941“. [Kraljevo in October of 1941]. *Kraljevo u ustanku 1941*. Zbornik radova, Narodni muzej Kraljeva i Istorijski arhiv Kraljeva.
- Krejaković S. (2013). „Identiteti žrtava streljanih u Kraljevu oktobra 1941“, [Identities of the victims shot in Kraljevo in October 1941]. Muzej žrtava genocida. Belgrade.
- Nađ D. (1971). *Kosta Nađ – vojnik tri armije*. [Kosta Nagy – soldier of three armies]. Novinsko-grafičko preduzeće "Proleter".
- Rummel R. (1994). *Democide: Nazi Genocide and Mass Murder*, Sage Publications, Ltd.
- Sami Z. (2004). Desperately Seeking Definition: The International Community's Quest for Identifying the Specter of Terrorism. *Cornell International Law Journal*.

- Simeunović D. (2009). *Uvod u političku teoriju*. [Political Theory - Introduction]. Institut za političke studije, 2009.
- Virijević V. (2006). *Kraljevo, grad u Srbiji 1918–1941*. [Kraljevo, a city in Serbia 1918–1941]. Narodni muzej Kraljevo, 2006.
- Weber M. (1978). *Economy and Society*. Vol. I. University of California Press.
- World Health Organization, World Report on Violence and Health, 2002.
- Zečević M. (1994). *Jugoslavija 1918–1992: Južnoslovenski državni san i java*. [Yugoslavia 1918–1992: The South Slavic State Dream and Reality]. Prosveta. Belgrade.

**Radomir Popović**

Ministarstvo odbrane  
Republika Srbija

## **POLITIČKO NASILJE U OKUPIRANOM KRALJEVU 1941. GODINE**

### **Sažetak**

*Tema istraživačkog rada koji je pred vama je primena fenomena političkog nasilja upotrebom represivnih mera tokom vojne okupacije u ratnim uslovima, prikazana na primeru grada Kraljeva tokom okupacije Kraljevine Jugoslavije od strane Trećeg rajha, odnosno nacističke Nemačke, tokom Drugog svetskog rata u ratnoj 1941. godini. Kroz događaje koji su doveli do masakra u gradu Kraljevu, prikazane su neke od represivnih mera koje su sprovodili pripadnici regularnih jedinica vojske nacističke Nemačke - Vermahta, koji su kao subjekt predstavljali mehanizam za sprovođenje represalije nad stanovništvom grada Kraljeva i njegove neposredne okoline, kao i procesi koji su se odvijali u društvenom, ekonomskom i političkom životu pogođenog i preživelog stanovništva i uticaj koji su zločini imali na stanovništvo grada i okoline, kao i na društveno-političke procese u društvu kako tokom samih događaja, tako i u budućnosti koja doseže do sadašnjosti, sa kratkim osvrtom na posledice koje su gore pomenute pojave ostavile na kolektivnu društveno-političku svest „kod Srba“.*

**Ključne reči:** *političko nasilje, okupacija, represivne mere, Kraljevo, masakr.*