

World War I in the Balkans, 1914-1918 – Third Balkan War?

Piotr MIKIETYŃSKI*

ABSTRACT

I would like to moot the question of the significance of the World War 1 in the reference to the Balkan Peninsula. I think, that we need to consider, why South-Eastern Europe became again the area of bloody war after only one year of relative peace. The wording “Third Balkan War” (with the question-mark) is the introduction to more serious and much more detailed historical and political debate.

The most important battles of World War 1 took place in the northern France and along vast Eastern Front. Although final results of World War 1 were based on efforts of armies of Great Powers (Great Britain, France, USA), governments of these states courted the support of smaller allies. This process had become particularly noticeable from the beginning of 1915, in other words at the moment of evident standstill (“position war”) on both fronts (West and East). Then, Great Powers started court for the co-operation of Balkan States. They possessed strategic locations and disposed of have use of considerable armed forces.

The Ottoman Empire was the first state, which decided to stand for the side of one fighting military bloc. On the spur of War M Enver-Pasha, Turkey signed on August 2nd, 1914 the secret agreement with Germany. In November 1914, Ottoman Empire was in war with allied states. The closing of the Straits for allied navies cut off successfully naval communication routes between Russia and its western allies. In response, British government accepted controversial plan of the opening of the Straits. It took the form of two unsuccessful allied operations: firstly, naval operation in Dardanelles (February 1915) and the second – naval-ground operation on the Gallipoli Peninsula (April 1915 – January 1916).

The accession of Italy to the war on the allied side in 1915 became the counterbalance for allied catastrophe in the Straits.

Bulgaria was the next state, which entered war. Takeover of the control in Macedonian territories (then in the Greek and Serbian possession) and Southern Dobrudzha (from Romania) were main Bulgarian war aims. Bulgarian activities were indirectly decisive in behaviors of Greece and Romania.

Keywords: *World War 1, Balkans, Ottoman Empire, Germany, Bulgaria*

“The tragedy, which took place in Sarajevo will not cause – I hope so – further complications”. These words were written by Arthur Nicolson – one of higher official in the British Foreign Office – in his note to British ambassador in Sankt-Petersburg.¹ Nicolson wrote this note on June 30th, 1914, two days after the assassination of archduke Franz Ferdinand of Austria. Hopes on the retention of brittle European peace still existed during the whole week after the tragedy in Sarajevo in main European powers. There was typical “silence before the storm”.

* *Dr hab. Piotr Mikietyński, associate professor, Jagellonian University, Institute of History, piotr.mikietynski@uj.edu.pl [personal data after correction]*

¹ Martin Gilbert, *Pierwsza wojna światowa [World War I]* (Poznań: Wydawnictwo Zysk i S-ka, 2003), p. 43.

However, we should ask – in the context of above-mentioned paper's title – where was real significance of the Balkans? Assassination in Sarajevo (June 28th, 1914) was only one of effects of long standing political conflicts and rivalries in that inflammatory region. It took place only about one year after Second Balkan War. This military conflict intensified mutual hostility between Balkan states. Bulgaria lost most of territorial spoils gained during First Balkan War. In the effect of its defeat, Bulgaria signed treaty of Bucharest (August 10th, 1913). Sofia managed to retain portion of Macedonia, Pirin Macedonia, including the town of Strumica, Western Thrace and 110 kilometers of Aegean coast. Instead, Sofia had to give up Southern Dobruja for Romania. Additionally, Bulgaria signed Provisions of the treaty of Istanbul (September 29th, 1913) obligated Sofia to return Edirne to the Ottoman Empire. Serbia was in a little better situation. It had sustained most territory of northern and central Macedonia and also direct border with Montenegro (Novi Pazar). Greece conquered more than half of Macedonia, southern part of Epirus province, access to southern Thrace (Kavala) and a few islands on the Aegean Sea.²

Second Balkan War finished Turkish rule in the Balkan Peninsula, except Istanbul and small part of Thrace's territory around the Ottoman capital. Consequences of that military conflict appeared more serious. Direct war between Balkan states for the legacy of Ottoman Empire opened new field for mutual hostilities. Firstly, the Bulgarian defeat meant the end of existence of Balkan League. That political agreement was created by Russia as the counter-balance for Austrian-Hungarian expansion in the region. Now, Bulgaria had to seek for new political partner in the struggle for the rebuilding of position and lost territories. That aspiration was at the heart of its better and better relations with Central Powers (Austria-Hungary and Germany). However, it should be noted about the real isolation of Sofia in the final period before the outbreak of World War I. Serbia was also seriously weakened, but it became only strategic ally in the Balkans for Russia

This last – above-mentioned sentence – had to influence the Austrian-Hungarian attitude to this still-existing Russian bridgehead in Vienna's zone of interests. Anyway, the assassination in Sarajevo was only useful pretext “to settle accounts” and make “definitive and total settlement” with Serbia.³ The process of “final solution of Serbian question” started after one month. Just on July 28th, 1914 Austria-Hungary declared war to Serbia in the situation of the guarantee on strong and loyal support from the side of German Empire. In consequence, Russia could not accept possible Serbian defeat and full Vienna's domination in the Balkans. The answer of Sankt-Petersburg could be only one. On the same day, Russia made partial mobilization of armed forces: 13 corps in 4 military districts: Moscow, Kiev, Odessa and Kazan. Russian minister for Foreign Affairs Sergey Dmitrievich Sazonov intimated Austrian-Hungarian ambassador count Mura-Szombat et Szechy-Sziget Frigyes Szapary de Szapar, that “mobilized Russian forces will only stand in arms in

2 Stevan K. Pavlowitch, *Historia Bałkanów, 1804-1945* [*History of the Balkans, 1804-1945*] (Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, 2009), p. 241.

3 Holger H. Herwig, *The First World War: Germany and Austria-Hungary, 1914-1918* (London-New York: Arnold, 1997), p. 10, 12.

case of threat of Balkan interests of Russia”.⁴

I think there should be mentioned, that Italy (from 1882 officially participant of Triple Alliance between Austria-Hungary, Germany and Italy) reacted on assassination in Sarajevo and further events with astonishing calm and aloofness. This attitude resulted from a few factors. Firstly, Austrian-Hungarian-Italian agreement, signed in 1887, comprised point saying about the possibility of “mutual compensations” in the Balkans in the case of “attack of third power”. On July 24th, 1914 – so just after official Austrian-Hungarian ultimatum against Serbia – Italian Foreign Minister Antonio Marquis di San Giuliano wrote to King Victor Emmanuel III, that Italy did not obligate to take part in the war. Rome should “make certain of minor compensations and (at least) the guarantee, that interests of Italy did not harm in return for each diplomatic support of allies”.⁵ Finally, Kingdom of Italy declared its neutrality on August 3rd, 1914. Similar political dilemmas existed in Romania. This state was also associated with Austria-Hungary and Germany on the base of treaty from October, 30th, 1883. However, in 1914 political and economic influences of Russia and France became much more effective than dynastic links with Germany. The question of Romanian attitude to the conflict between Austria-Hungary and Serbia became the main subject of meeting of the Crown Council (August 3rd, 1914). King Charles I Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen tried to argue about the necessity of Romanian access to the alliance with Central Powers in the context of Bucharest's aspirations for Bessarabia (lost to Russia in 1878). After turbulent debate, the king accepted the status of Romanian neutrality. Additionally, Romanian government had guaranteed, that Romania “will not fight against Bulgaria in the case of Bulgarian attack against Serbia”.⁶

I think we can understand causes of the outbreak of World War I by the analysis of key-documents. Memorial written in December 1914 by Baron Leopold Andrian-Werburg is one of those documents. Austrian-Hungarian diplomat concentrated on the Balkans and told that: “It will regard – according to prestigious and self-preservative considerations – as the war will end satisfactorily for us if Serbia's material and moral diminution will present Serbia and the whole Europe the total fiasco of the all-Serbian policy”.⁷ By the way, Andrian proposed so-called “minimal solution” (territorial compensations for Austria-Hungary – bridgeheads on Sava and Danube rivers, Šabac and Belgrade and control on the Iron Gate) and “maximal solution” (obligatory zone-union between Austria-Hungary and Serbia, military convention and agreement about the Austrian-Hungarian representation on

4 Ludwig Bittner, Hans Uebersberger (eds.), *Österreich-Ungarns Aussenpolitik von der Bosnischen Krise bis zum Kriegsausbruch 1914. Diplomatische Aktenstücke des österreichisch-ungarischen Ministeriums des Äusseren*, vol. 8 (Wien-Leipzig: Österreichischer Bundesverlag, 1930), p. 899-900.

5 Luigi Albertini, *The Origins of the War 1914. European Relations from the Congress of Berlin to the Eve of the Sarajevo Murder*, vol. II (London-New York-Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1953), p. 311-322.

6 Op. cit., s. 402-413.

7 *Übersicht der für den Friedensschluss in Erwägung zu ziehenden Lösungsmodalitäten der gegennärtigen Krise 6/12 1914*, cited by: by Imre Gonda, *Verfall der Kaiserreiche in Mitteleuropa. Der Zweibund in den letzten Kriegsjahren (1916-1918)* (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1977), p. 306-311.

the diplomatic arena, possible annexation of Wallachia and western Moldova). The continuation of Austrian-Hungarian political debate on the question of future status of the Balkans took place in 1916 and 1917. In January 1916, Austrian-Hungarian Foreign Minister Baron Stephan Burian de Rajecz proposed the next conception of Austrian-Hungarian expansion in the Balkans: “Southslavic question must find its solution in the borders of [Austrian-Hungarian] monarchy”.⁸ In January 1917, Austrian emperor Charles I presented again minimal and maximal programme for the Balkans. First plan suggested: the annexation of Serbia and Montenegro, territorial compensations in Transylvania and the removal of Karađorđević dynasty. Second plan told about: the territorial integrity of Serbia, annexation strategical mount Lovćen and again about the removal of the Karađorđevićs. In March 1917 new Austrian-Hungarian Foreign Minister Count Ottokar Czernin von und zu Chudenitz told about the “border corrections” in Serbia and Montenegro (Lovćen, Antivari, Serbian bridgeheads).⁹

However, the most meaningful plan for the Balkans was given by Russia. On September 14th, 1914, Russian Foreign Minister Sergey D. Sazonov presented his proposals during the meeting with British and French ambassadors. He suggested serious territorial corrections: Serbia (Bosnia and Herzegovina, Dalmatia and northern Albania), Bulgaria (compensations in Macedonia) and Greece (southern Albania without Vlora). Now, we must mention, that Russia added the question of the Straits just in the end of October 1914 (after the access of the Ottoman Empire to the Triple Alliance). Then, Sazonov told directly about the annexation of the Straits and the group of islands on the Aegean Sea (Tenedos-Bozcaada, Imbros-Gökçeada, Lemnos and Samothrace).

Warfare in the Balkans began on August 12th, 1914 from the attack made by Austrian-Hungarian 2 army (General Oskar Potiorek) from north-west on the direction to Belgrade and Valjevo. Additionally, Austrian-Hungarian 5 army advanced on Serbian defenses on the line of lower Drina river. After weekly bloody and fierce struggles, Serbian 2 army advanced in the area of Mount Čer (the sector of Austrian-Hungarian 5 army). Austrians were defeated and forced to the retreat behind Drina river.¹⁰ Battle of Mount Čer ended first phase of Balkan campaign. It symbolized also the collapse of Austrian-Hungarian hopes on short-lived war with Serbia and the possibility of transfer of forces on the Russian front. On September 6th, 1914 the Serbs tried to make counter-offensive (General Petar Bojović's 1 army) across Sava on Syrmia and Bosnia. However, this operation was unsuccessful in the context of the situation in Drina sector. On September 7th, Austrians beg only repeat offensive. It lasted 5 days, but Austrians had to go to the defensive. Both sides suffered on Drina

8 Stephan Burián von Rajecz, *Drei Jahre aus der Zeit meiner Amtsführung im Kriege* (Berlin: Ullstein, 1923), p. 109.

9 *Protokolle des Gemeinsamen Ministerrates der Österreichisch-Ungarischen Monarchie (1914-1918)*, Miklos Komjathy (ed.) (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó: 1966), p. 352-381 and 482-491.

10 David Jordan, *Historia I wojny światowej: Balkany, Włochy i Afryka 1914-1918. Od Sarajewa do Piawy i jeziora Tanganika* [The History of World War I: The Balkans, Italy and Africa, 1914-1918. From Sarajevo to the Piave and Lake Tanganyika] (Poznań: Dom Wydawniczy REBIS, 2011), p. 28.

sector horrible losses (around 10.000 soldiers by both sides). On November 6th, 1914 Austrians began their third offensive against Serbia. Now, they directed their advance on Valjevo in the center of the front. During first phase of offensive, Austrians got through to Valjevo on November 15th, after nine days of bloody struggles. Serbian forces withdrew in the direction of Kolubara river on well-prepared and covered with forest defenses. The culmination of Austrian-Hungarian successes took place on December 2nd, 1914 when Serbian capital Belgrade was captured. However, Austrian-Hungarian rule in the city lasted only 13 days. This situation resulted from the successes of Serbian counter-offensive and the regaining of control on lower Drina. The first period of Balkan campaign had dramatic costs for both sides. Austria-Hungary lost above 227.000 killed, injured and prisoners of war (POW). Serbia could halt the advance of enemy, but armed forces were extremely exhausted and lost above 170.000 soldiers.

The stalemate situation in the Balkans was to change in September-October 1915. Firstly, on September 6th, 1915 Bulgaria signed the political-military agreement with Austria-Hungary. Sofia declared its access to the Triple Alliance a week after renewed offensive of Austrian-Hungarian forces (but now under German command) against Serbia. Bulgarians received – in exchange for their access – promise of territorial compensation (Macedonia and areas in northern and eastern Serbia). New offensive against Serbia was to undertake by Austrian-Hungarian and German forces (General Hermann von Kövess' 3 army and General Max von Gallwitz's 11 army, respectively), commanded by General August von Mackensen. After two-monthly campaign allied forces (supported from October 15th by Bulgarian 1 and 2 armies) conquered whole Serbia (and also Montenegro) and survivors (about 140.000) of defeated Serbian army evacuated to Albania and later (by the support of British navy) on Greek island Corfu.¹¹

Serbian campaign 1914-1915 was only one of meaningful episodes of so-called "Third Balkan War". This analysis of the role of the Balkan states during World War I should be continued and more extended.

Above-mentioned Bulgarian access to the war in the Balkans on Austrian-Hungarian and German side was nowise something surprised. Kingdom of Bulgaria was the state situated strategically on the way between Austria-Hungary and Ottoman Empire. It bordered on: Greece, Romania, Serbia and Ottoman Empire. That factor was tempting for both sides of the conflict. However, powers of Triple Entente (France, Great Britain and Russia) could offer Sofia only potential small territorial corrections after the collapse of Turkey. Totally different situation was in regards to Central Powers. They needed Bulgaria as the important ally against Serbia and Greece. Anyway, Berlin and Vienna could use cynically Bulgarian lust of revenge after defeat in the Second Balkan War in their own strategic interests. Additionally, Germany could consider the fact of dynastic affiliations between tsar of Bulgaria Ferdinand I and rulers of Austria-Hungary and Germany. Pro-German Ferdinand I and prime-minister Vasil Hristov Radoslavov vacillated longly, but finally they decided about the

11 Erich von Falkenhayn, *Die Oberste Heeresleitung 1914-1916 in ihren wichtigsten Entschliessungen* (Berlin: E.S. Mittler, 1920), p. 139-141, 148-152; Hermann von Kuhl, *Der Weltkrieg 1914-1918* (Berlin: W. Kolk, 1929), p. 279-286.

access of their state to the war against Serbia under influence of intensive German preparations to decisive offensive. Of course, Berlin's and Vienna's promises of territorial acquisitions (whole Macedonia, return of Maritsa valley by Turkey, access to the Adriatic Sea and special corridor to Austria-Hungary) in the case of access of Greece and Romania on the side of Triple Alliance helped in making this essential (for future Bulgarian fate) decision.¹² The brilliant common victory on Serbia and Montenegro caused, that tsar Ferdinand I became confident again. Fears for possible Russian engagement in the Balkans became then totally invalid. Ferdinand I confirmed his position, when he promulgated in January 1916 in the National Assembly Bulgarian war aim: “unification of Bulgarian nation in its historical and ethnic borders”. It was to mean access to three seas: Black, Aegean and Adriatic.¹³

Of course, we cannot discuss about the World War I without questions of the accession of Turkey and Greece to the war.

The Turkish attitude to events on the Balkan Peninsula in June-July 1914 was very temperate. It resulted from the consciousness of own vulnerability, which was showed during Balkan Wars. On the other hand, the Ottoman Empire was closely connected (politically, economically and military) with Germany. It should also be remembered, that War Minister Enver Pasha was one of most influential persons in the Ottoman Empire. Minister thought, that he will accomplish further modernization of Turkish army. There will make possible to realize Enver's his own pan-Turkish plans, which didn't concern to the Balkans but rather to the Caucasus, Crimea and Russian part of Central Asia. Turkish access to the war had its key-meaning for Germany and Austria-Hungary, because it could break off communication between Russia and its Western allies as the creation of territorial unity between all states of the Triple Alliance. The latter question was – as we can say – vital sense for Turkey because of the importance of war supplies.

At the beginning during dramatic events in June-July 1914, Ottoman Empire was absorbed by the conflict with Greece on the base of affiliation of Aegean Islands. However, finally on August 2nd, secret allied agreement with Germany was signed. Officially, on August 5th, Ottoman Empire declared the neutrality regarding the war in Europe. This attitude eventuated from optimistic premises, that the campaign will ended soon, Bulgaria and Romania will join to the Triple Alliance and the Ottoman Empire will able to conduct (with Bulgarian support) war against Greece and Serbia. Germany agreed (from their side), that Turkey will receive (in the case of Greek access to the war) all Aegean Islands and corrections of borders with its Balkan neighbors.¹⁴ The latter mentioned question didn't concern Bulgaria, because mutual Bulgarian-Turkish relations improved, in particular in the effect of activity of Turkish mission in Sofia (chief: Ali Fethi, military attaché Mustafa Kemal). Finally, on August 2nd, 1914 Turkish-German secret agreement was signed (by Enver Pasha, Mehmet Talât, Said Halim and German ambassador Baron Hans von Wangenheim) in Istanbul.

12 Hans Roger Madol, *Ferdinand von Bulgarien. Der Traum von Byzanz* [*Ferdinand of Bulgarien. The Dream about Byzantium*] (Berlin: Universitas, 1931), p. 196-213.

13 S.K. Pavlowitch, op. cit., p. 256.

14 Ian F.W. Beckett, *Pierwsza wojna światowa 1914-1918* [*The Great War, 1914-1918*] (Warszawa: Książka i Wiedza, 2009), p.107.

This agreement concerned active Turkish participation in war against Russia but simultaneous neutrality in campaign in the Balkans.¹⁵

Circumstances of Greek engagement in the World War I presented totally differently. It should be discussed something more about the domestic situation in Greece. King Constantine I became related with German Emperor Wilhelm II by marriage with His sister princess Sophie. King was also excited about German military and political power. He had great antagonist in Eleftherios Venizelos. This distinguished Greek liberal politician was the supporter of the “Great Idea”, the unification of all Greeks in one national state. He thought that the greatest opportunity for the realization of this conception is only in the alliance with Great Britain and France. Only these two states were able to result in the final destruction of Ottoman Empire and concrete serious territorial compensations just for Greece in the Asia Minor (Anatolia). Venizelos operated so consequent to the point, that he openly proposed Entente the organization of British-French military intervention in Greece (officially for so-called security-guarantee against possible Bulgarian aggression), but without the creation of complicated political situation for Athens.¹⁶ On October 4th, 1915 – after many domestic conflicts (two Venizelos' dismissals, permanent rivalry between the king and the part of Greek parliament) – prime-minister Venizelos declared the access of his state to the war on the side of Entente. He explained this situation by the threat of “security and dignity of the state”. Now, situation evaluated quickly. On September 23rd, 1915, king Constantine I decreed the mobilization of the Greek army (in the response on similar declaration of Bulgaria). On October 5th, 1915 allied Expedition Corps (20.000 French and British soldiers) landed in Thessaloniki. Greek government tried to protest, but without any positive effects. Greece still remained neutral (until May 29th, 1917) and the presence of Allied Expedition Corps was to strengthen moral power of Entente after Serbian and Montenegrin catastrophes. It was to play decisive role in future campaigns against Central Powers (in particular in 1917-1918).

The understanding of the whole complexity of the situation in the Balkans during World War I will impossible without – even in general – the mention about Romania. This state was (and – I think – still is) treated as a kind of “the gate” to the Balkans. We should also remember that Kingdom Romania was active participant of the Second Balkan War (1913) and it was in the long standing conflict with Bulgaria (the question of Southern Dobrudzha). The situation of Romania during last period before the outbreak of World War I was extremely complicated. The state was situated between two powers: Austria-Hungary and Russia. So, it had to conduct the policy of cautious balance. However, Romanian political elites presented evident pro-German sympathies. This circumstance has resulted two factors. Firstly, Romania signed in 1881 trade treaty with Germany. It still existed during next decades and symbolized strong presence of German capital and business. This tendency was confirmed in 1883 by five-year top-secret alliance with Austria-Hungary and Germany. This

15 Dariusz Kolodziejczyk, *Turcja* [Turkey] (Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Trio, 2000), p. 68.

16 Paul Guinn, *British Strategy and Politics 1914 to 1918* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965), p. 57-58.

agreement was directed against Russia. It was regularly prolonged until 1913.¹⁷ After the outbreak of European war, Romania tried to maintain the neutrality (officially declared on August 4th, 1914). This policy lasted to 1916, but in the atmosphere of regular diplomatic pressures from both sides of the conflict. However, key-events took place in August 1916. Finally, on August 17th Romania signed in Bucharest political treaty and military convention with Entente. Bucharest received guarantees of territorial integrity and promises of concrete compensations (Transylvania, Banat and Bukovina). Romania covenanted to begin military operations against Austria-Hungary on August 28th, three days after British and French offensive from Thessaloniki.¹⁸ During first month of campaign Romanian forces broke into Transylvania on the depth 130 km, but there were first and last successes. On August 28th, 1916 German Field-Marshal August von Mackensen took over the High Command of allied German, Austrian-Hungarian, Bulgarian and Turkish armies in Dobrudzha and south of Danube river.¹⁹ On September 2nd, 1916 Romanians were attacked from two directions: from Southern Dobrudzha (German, Bulgarian and Turkish forces) and from Transylvania (German and Austrian-Hungarian forces). On December 6th, allied forces entered to Bucharest. In 1917 Germans and Austrians conquered southern Moldova and whole Wallachia. On December 10th, 1917, Romania had to sign armistice.

We should conclude, World War I eventuated all Balkan states in the situation that they became involved in that bloody global military conflict. The war in the Balkans, 1914-1918 turn out to be only the next phase of political, national and economical rivalry in this important part of European continent. I used in the title of this paper the term “third Balkan war”. We can discuss – after the historical experience of the World War II and military conflicts in former Yugoslavia – about the continuation of drama in the second half of the 20th century.

17 Janusz Pajewski, *Pierwsza wojna światowa 1914-1918* [*World War I, 1914-1918*] (Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1991), p. 402.

18 Henryk Batowski, *Rozpad Austro-Węgier 1914-1918 (sprawy narodowościowe i działania dyplomatyczne)* [*Disintegration of Austria-Hungary, 1914-1918 (ethnic affairs and diplomatic activities)*] (Kraków: Wydawnictwo Literackie, 1982), p. 145-149.

19 Arthur Arz von Straussenburg, *Zur Geschichte des Grossen Krieges 1914-1918* [*About the History of Great War, 1914-1918*] (Graz: Akademischer Druck- und Verlagsanstalt, 1969), p. 103.

Bibliography

- Albertini, Luigi, *The Origins of the War 1914. European Relations from the Congress of Berlin to the Eve of the Sarajevo Murder*, vol. II (London-New York-Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1953).
- Arz von Straussenburg, Arthur, *Zur Geschichte des Grossen Krieges 1914-1918* [*About the History of Great War, 1914-1918*] (Graz: Akademischer Druck- und Verlagsanstalt, 1969)
- Bartlett, Christopher, *Konflikt globalny. Międzynarodowa rywalizacja wielkich mocarstw w latach 1880-1990* [*The Global Conflict. International Rivalry of the Great Powers, 1880-1990*], Wrocław-Warszawa-Kraków: Wydawnictwo Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 1997).
- Batowski, Henryk, *Rozpad Austro-Węgier 1914-1918 (sprawy narodowościowe i działania dyplomatyczne)* [*Disintegration of Austria-Hungary, 1914-1918 (ethnic affairs and diplomatic activities)*] (Kraków: Wydawnictwo Literackie, 1982)
- Beckett, Ian F.W., *Pierwsza wojna światowa 1914-1918* [*The Great War, 1914-1918*] (Warszawa: Książka i Wiedza, 2009).
- Bittner, Ludwig, Uebersberger, Hans (eds.), *Österreich-Ungarns Aussenpolitik. Von der bosnischen Krise 1908 bis zum Kriegsbruch 1914* [*Foreign Policy of Austria-Hungary. From Bosnian Crisis to the Outbreak of the War 1914*], vol. 8 (Wien-Leipzig: Österreichischer Bundesverlag, 1930).
- Burián von Rajecz, Stephan, *Drei Jahre aus der Zeit meiner Amtsführung im Kriege* [*Three Years of My Service in War*] (Berlin: Ullstein, 1923).
- Falkenhayn Erich von, *Die Oberste Heeresleitung 1914-1916 in ihren wichtigsten Entschliessungen* [*Supreme High Command of the Armed Forces, 1914-1916 in its most important resolutions*] (Berlin: E.S. Mittler, 1920).
- Gilbert, Martin, *Pierwsza wojna światowa* [*First World War*] (Poznań: Wydawnictwo Zysk i S-ka, 2003).
- Gonda, Imre, *Verfall der Kaiserreiche in Mitteleuropa. Der Zweibund in den letzten Kriegsjahren (1916-1918)* [*The Decline of Empires in the Central Europe. Double Alliance in Last War Years*] (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1977).
- Guinn, Paul, *British Strategy and Politics 1914 to 1918* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965),
- Herwig, Holger H., *The First World War: Germany and Austria-Hungary, 1914-1918* (London-New York: Arnold, 1997).
- Jordan, David, *Historia I wojny światowej: Bałkany, Włochy i Afryka 1914-1918. Od Sarajewa do Piawy i jeziora Tanganika* [*The History of World War I: The Balkans, Italy and Africa, 1914-1918. From Sarajevo to the Piave and Lake Tanganyika*] (Poznań: Dom Wydawniczy REBIS, 2011)
- Kołodziejczyk, Dariusz, *Turcja* [*Turcja*] (Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Trio, 2000).
- Kuhl, Hermann von, *Der Weltkrieg 1914-1918* [*World War, 1914-1918*] (Berlin: W. Kolk, 1929).
- Madol, Hans Roger, *Ferdinand von Bulgarien. Der Traum von Byzanz* [*Ferdinand of Bulgaria. The Dream about Byzantium*] (Berlin: Universitas, 1931).
- Pajewski, Janusz, *Pierwsza wojna światowa 1914-1918* [*World War I, 1914-1918*] (Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1991)
- Pavlowitch, Stevan K., *Historia Bałkanów (1804-1945)* [*A History of the Balkans*] (Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, 2009).
- Protokolle des Gemeinsamen Ministerrates der Österreichisch-Ungarischen Monarchie (1914-1918)* [*Protocols of the Common Council of Ministers of the Austrian-Hungarian Monarchy, 1914-1918*], Miklos Komjathy (ed.) (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó: 1966).