

16

Veiled Survivors: Jews, Roma and Muslims in the Years of the Holocaust

David Motadel

In the months following Hitler's invasion of the Soviet Union, SS squads – the so-called *Einsatzgruppen* – executed hundreds of Muslim prisoners of war who had fought in the Red Army, assuming that their circumcision proved that they were Jewish.¹ In Berlin, these executions soon became the subject of controversy. During a meeting of officers of the Wehrmacht, SS and Ministry for the Occupied Eastern Territories in summer 1941, Erwin von Lahousen, an official of the Wehrmacht intelligence agency representing his boss, Wilhelm Canaris, engaged in a row with the head of the Gestapo, Heinrich Müller, about these killings. Lahousen brought up the selection of hundreds of Muslim Tatars, who had been sent to 'special treatment' because they were taken for Jews. Müller acknowledged that the SS had made mistakes in this respect, remarking that it was the first time that he had heard that Muslims were circumcised like Jews. A few weeks later, Müller's superior, Reinhard Heydrich, chief of the Reich Security Main Office, sent out instructions urging the *Einsatzgruppen* to be more careful: The 'circumcision' and 'Jewish appearance' could not be taken as sufficient 'proof of Jewish descent', he made clear.² Muslims and Jews were not to be confused. In the following year, the Ministry for the Occupied Eastern Territories issued a similar directive on the identification of 'Jews' in the Eastern territories, warning that only in the western Russian territories could circumcision be seen as a proof of Jewishness. 'In those regions, though, in which Mohammedans exist we will not be able to base the Jewishness of the person on circumcision alone'.³ There, other indicators, such as names, origins and ethnic appearance, had to be considered as well.

The swift intervention to stop the shootings of Muslims stemmed from the concerns of leading Nazi officials about Germany's relations with the Islamic world.⁴ At the height of the Second World War, as Hitler's soldiers marched into Muslim-populated territories in the Balkans, North Africa, the Crimea and the Caucasus, and approached the Middle East and Central Asia, Berlin began

to promote Nazi Germany as a protector of Islam. In an orchestrated effort that involved all major branches of the regime – most notably the Wehrmacht, the SS, the Ministry for the Occupied Eastern Territories, and the Propaganda Ministry – Berlin tried to mobilize Muslims across the Islamic world against the Soviet Union, the British Empire, and Jews. This was reflected in Germany's policies and propaganda in the Muslim war zones, and in the recruitment, spiritual care and ideological indoctrination of tens of thousands of Muslim volunteers who fought in the Wehrmacht and the SS. German officials frequently viewed Muslim populations under the rubric of 'Islam'. In terms of racial barriers, the Germans showed remarkable pragmatism: (Non-Jewish) Turks, Iranians and Arabs had already been explicitly exempted from any official racial discrimination in the 1930s, following diplomatic interventions from the governments in Tehran, Ankara and Cairo. During the war the Nazi regime showed similar pragmatism when encountering Muslims from Bosnia, Herzegovina and Albania, and the Turkic peoples of the Soviet Union. Muslims, it was clear to every German officer from the Sahara to the Caucasus, were to be treated as allies.

And yet, the shooting of Muslim prisoners of war on the eastern front shows that this official policy towards Muslims was by no means straightforward. Nazi Germany's policy towards Muslims was in many ways entangled with the history of the Holocaust. On the ground, German soldiers encountered Muslim Roma, Jewish converts to Islam, Jewish sects that had adopted some Islamic practices and Muslims who were taken for Jews. The lines between these population groups were not always clear to Nazi executioners. This could lead to the murder of Muslims who were mistaken for Jews, as shown, but it could also lead to the survival of Jews, and indeed Roma, who were classified as Muslims. This essay will examine some of these cases. It will thereby show how Nazi policies towards ethnic and religious minorities, as worked out by bureaucrats in Berlin, could clash with the realities on the ground, where Nazi officials encountered often highly complex religious and ethnic landscapes.

There is a growing historiography of Muslim–Jewish encounters during the Holocaust. Most of this research has focused on the Arab world. Scholars have shown a remarkable interest in the collaboration of the legendary mufti of Jerusalem, Amin al-Husayni, who came to Berlin during the war, called in his propaganda speeches for the annihilation of Jews, and even became involved in the Holocaust, successfully intervening to stop the emigration of Jews from Germany's south-eastern European satellite states to Palestine in 1943.⁵ Moreover, there is considerable research on perceptions in Arabic countries of Nazism and Nazi anti-Semitism before, during, and after the Second World War.⁶ Long ignored in all of this research is the fact that the Holocaust involved many ordinary Muslims more immediately, in the front zones.⁷ This essay will contribute to our knowledge of these entanglements, drawing a

first sketch of these connected histories of Jews, Roma and Muslims during the Holocaust.

I

The first place where the advancing German troops encountered not only a Jewish but also a significant Muslim minority was occupied Paris.⁸ During the war years, around 100,000 Muslims lived in France, most of them colonial migrants. The centre of Islam in France was the Grande Mosquée de Paris, which was directed by the charismatic and cosmopolitan dignitary Si Kaddour Benghabrit.⁹ Benghabrit was from the outset eager to establish good relations with German and Vichy authorities to improve the situation of his community. In early 1941, for instance, he asked the Germans to send his imams into their prisoner of war camps to look after the Muslim inmates, and offered in return to speak on Germany's Arabic broadcast propaganda service.¹⁰ The German authorities in Paris supported him, regularly visiting the mosque and trying to use it for their propaganda. At the same time, however, Vichy and Nazi officials kept the mosque under surveillance as they suspected that it provided Jews with false documents stating that they were Muslims.¹¹ 'The Occupation authorities suspected personnel of the Paris mosque of delivering fraudulently to individuals of Jewish race certificates attesting that the interested are of Muslim confession', an internal note of the French Interior Ministry from 24 September 1940 warned.¹² Apparently an imam of the mosque was even summoned and questioned by the authorities. Although our knowledge on these events is still fragmentary, we do know from oral testimonies that Benghabrit and the mosque's senior imam, Si Muhammad Benzouaou, helped a number of individual North African Jews by certifying that they were Muslim. Among them was a certain Albert Assouline, an Algerian-born Jew who, after the war, gave the first account of this story, and Salim Hallali, a popular Jewish-Algerian musician who found refuge in the mosque, was offered papers and survived. Another case ended more tragically: Maurice Moïse Moatti, a Jewish Tunisian, was offered papers testifying that he was a Tunisian Muslim, but still registered as 'Jewish' with the German authorities and was later killed in Auschwitz. After the war, rumours spread that the mosque had systematically organized help for hundreds of Jews, though so far no evidence for such claims has emerged.

Clearly, Benghabrit's mosque did support some individuals, especially North African Jews, who shared the same language, customs and migrant milieu. Yet, there is also a darker side to this story. As Ethan Katz has shown, Benghabrit collaborated closely with Vichy's General Commissariat for Jewish Questions (*Commissariat Générale aux Questions Juives*): the commissariat frequently contacted Benghabrit to confirm the identity of persons who claimed to be Muslims

but were suspected to be Jewish, and in a number of cases Benghabrit deliberately dismissed the claims, thereby facilitating their deportation; there might also, of course, have been cases when he approved the claims of Jews (and indeed Muslims) of being Islamic, but no known evidence exists to confirm this. Paradoxical and murky, the story of the Paris mosque shows that numerous Jews tried to adopt an Islamic identity to escape persecution and death – some were successful, others not. The survivors of the Paris mosque are the first cases of Jews who escaped the Holocaust in Islamic disguise during the Second World War. Yet they were not the only ones.

Similar is the story of Paris's community of Iranian Jews – the Centre for Advance Holocaust Studies estimates that around 150 Jews from Iran, Afghanistan and Bukhara lived in wartime France – who tried to escape the Holocaust.¹³ As the Germans began rounding up the Jewish population of Paris, many Iranian Jewish exiles turned for help to Abdol Hossein Sardari, the Iranian consul in the French capital. After the occupation, the Iranian ambassador Anoushirvan Sepahbodi had moved to Vichy, leaving Sardari behind to deal with consular affairs in Paris; and when the consulate was closed after the Anglo-Soviet invasion of Iran in the summer of 1941, Sardari remained in Paris and consulted the Swiss legation, which now officially represented the Iranian exiles. The German occupation authorities suspected Sardari of smuggling and running a studio for nude photography. Sardari was, no doubt, a *bon vivant*, regularly throwing lavish parties at his country house outside Paris, to which he invited high-ranking Germans; his contacts with the German embassy were particularly good. On 12 August 1942, Sardari sent a memorandum, addressed to the embassy, asking on behalf of the Iranian Jews to have the stamp 'Jew' removed from their identity cards.¹⁴ He attached a memorandum written by a number of Iranian Jews, which argued that these Jews (it spoke of 'Iranians of the mosaic faith') were racially Iranians, deeply rooted in the culture of Iranian Muslims, and without connection to the 'Jewish race of Europe'.¹⁵ Sardari also attached a list of 28 names of 'Iranians of the mosaic faith' living in Paris.¹⁶

The request led to an intense discussion in Berlin involving the Foreign Office, the Interior Ministry, the Reich Security Main Office (*Reichssicherheitshauptamt*), Walter Groß's NSDAP Office of Race Politics (*Rassenpolitisches Amt der NSDAP*), the Institute for Study of the Jewish Question (*Institut zur Erforschung der Judenfrage*), and the Reich Institute for the History of the New Germany (*Reichsinstitut für Geschichte des Neuen Deutschlands*). The regime's experts dismissed the memorandum. In a lengthy report, Adolf Eichmann rejected the request as 'one of the typical Jewish veiling and camouflage attempts'.¹⁷ Challenging the claim that Iranian Jews shared the customs and habits of their Muslim compatriots, Eichmann argued that there had always been a strict separation between Jews and Muslims in Iran. Similarly, Walter Groß wrote: 'I have no doubt that these are Jews'.¹⁸

Soon, the Iranian-Jewish community in Paris made a number of new attempts – two requests submitted by Sardari on 29 September 1942 and 17 March 1943 and one submitted by the Swiss legation on 11 March 1943 – to be exempted from anti-Jewish measures; they now tried to portray themselves as Jugutis, a Muslim group descending from Persian Jews who converted to Islam in the nineteenth century, though keeping some Jewish customs, and were officially classified in Iran as Muslim.¹⁹ As in the case of the Paris mosque, Islam seemed to provide the most obvious way to escape persecution. To his request of 17 March 1943 Sardari again attached a list of names of the persons concerned, this time 38; 28 of them were identical to the names on the list of 12 August 1942.²⁰ In the Foreign Office, this attempt was initially met with some goodwill: Friedrich-Werner Graf von der Schulenburg, former envoy in Tehran, who was later executed for his involvement in the 20 July 1944 plot against Hitler, noted that the Jugutis were an ‘Islamic sect’ that generally followed ‘Mohammedan laws’ and only very few religious rites of the mosaic faith, and had Iranian, not Semitic, blood, concluding: ‘It therefore appears to be factually unjustified to apply the German Jew laws to the Jugutis’.²¹ Moreover, any discrimination of the group should be avoided for political reasons, he argued, given Germany’s interest in the Middle East. The Wilhelmstraße informed Eichmann at the Reich Security Main Office that members of the ‘Islamic sect of the Jugutis’ were to be exempt from the ‘German Jewish directives’.²²

It seems that Jugutis were eventually indeed classified as Muslims. Yet, there was a problem: the Foreign Office had forwarded on to the Reich Security Main Office Sardari’s new list. Friedrich Bosshammer, a bureaucrat at Eichmann’s office, quickly objected that the names on the list were identical with those on the list of Iranian Jews that had been delivered by Sardari in autumn 1942. The Foreign Office had to agree, with Eberhard von Thadden, then head of the Foreign Office’s ‘Jewish desk’ (*Judenreferat*) speaking of ‘a typical Jewish trick’.²³ It was ruled that Iranian Jews were to be treated like Jews of hostile states.²⁴ All requests by Iranians who claimed to be Jugutis were to be checked individually. By sending the list, Sardari had put the Jews in immediate danger – although, in his defence, he believed the names to be known to the German authorities anyway, since they had already been registered. In the end, some Iranian Jews survived, being accepted as Islamic Jugutis. Among them was Ebrahim Morady, who appeared on both of Sardari’s lists and who in 1994 attended a ceremony honouring the Iranian consul at the Simon Wiesenthal Center in Los Angeles. After the war, many rumours emerged about this episode, including the claim that Sardari also helped many non-Iranian Jews by providing them with Iranian passports (Iranian passports did not indicate the religious affiliation of their holders), and that he took money for his services, but so far no evidence has been found to support these stories. Overall, the case provides another example of attempts by Jews to escape persecution as Muslims.

As the Germans marched into Muslim-populated areas in North Africa, south-eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, they soon encountered similar problems, and indeed held similar discussions about the categorization of Muslims and Jews. So far, we have only limited knowledge about these cases in North Africa, where Muslims and Jews lived under the oppressive rule of Berlin's partners – Fascist Italy, which ruled Libya, and Vichy France, which controlled Morocco, Algeria, and Tunisia. Yet, it seems that here, too, conflicts about the demarcation between 'Jews' and 'Muslims' emerged. The most famous example is the case of Morocco, where Sultan Muhammad V, who supported his Jewish subjects against discrimination, refused to consider Jewish converts to Islam as 'Jewish' – resisting racial definitions of Jewishness.²⁵ Future research will have to determine as to what extent Jews tried to escape persecution in North Africa by claiming to be Muslim or by converting to Islam.

We know much more about such entanglements of Jews and Muslims in the wartime Balkans. In Ustaša Croatia – a puppet state under the Catholic nationalist 'Poglavnik' Ante Pavelić, installed by Hitler following the German invasion and dissolution of the Yugoslav kingdom in spring 1941, and which included Muslim-populated Bosnia and Herzegovina – officials persecuted Jews with great brutality, while at least formally trying to court the Muslim population. In fact, Pavelić made Islam the second state religion, and his officials praised Muslims as 'the flower of the Croatian people'.²⁶ In the heart of Zagreb, they opened the massive Poglavnik Mosque (*Poglavnikova Džamija*). The privileged position of Muslims (and indeed Catholics) in the new state seemed to many Jews as an opportunity to avoid persecution. Soon, many tried to escape repression and deportation through conversion to Islam.²⁷ In Sarajevo alone, around 20 per cent of the Jewish population is estimated to have converted to Islam or Catholicism between April and October 1941. In the autumn of 1941, Ustaša authorities finally intervened, prohibiting these conversions. Yet, even those who had already converted were not safe from persecution, as it was race, not religion, that defined Jewishness in the eyes of Ustaša bureaucrats. The role of the religious Islamic dignitaries in this story was ambivalent. The highest religious authority of the country, *Reis-ul-Ulema* Fehim Spaho, former president of the High Shari'a Court in Sarajevo and a respected reformist cleric who advocated a strict interpretation of Islam, and who had cultivated good relations with the Germans, officially endorsed the Ustaša line, publicly declaring in late 1941 that conversion had no impact on race and that Jewish converts to Islam would still remain racially Jewish. On the other hand, Spaho made remarkable efforts to help Jewish converts to Islam, urging Ustaša officials to protect them and exhorting the 'ulama to offer them shelter. Conversion was, however, only one way to escape persecution. A number of Jews actually managed to flee the country concealed as Muslims. Some of them – women and men – literally disguised themselves in the Islamic veil.²⁸ Jewish men wore the fez, which had

become distinct Islamic headgear in the region, a physical marker of religious boundaries, although Ustaša decrees were issued that strictly prohibited Jews from wearing it.

II

The most controversial discussions about the distinction between, and classification of, Jews and Muslims emerged on the southern fringes of the Eastern Front. Here, entire population groups were affected. As shown in the introduction of this chapter, German killing squads in the East had problems distinguishing Muslims from Jews from the beginning. When *Einsatzgruppe D* began killing the Jews of the Crimea and the Caucasus, it was confronted with a special situation with regard to three Jewish population groups which had long lived alongside the Muslim communities: Karaites, Krymchaks and Judeo-Tats.²⁹

In the Crimea, invaded by German and Romanian troops under the command of Erich von Manstein in the autumn of 1941, SS officials were puzzled when encountering the Turkic-speaking Karaites (4000 to 5000 people) and Krymchaks (3000 to 5000 people).³⁰ Both were Jewish sects who had over the centuries lived closely with the Muslim Tatar population and were influenced by Islamic Tatar culture. The Germans made extensive efforts to win the Crimean Tatars over as collaborators – as part of their efforts to pacify the peninsula and as part of Berlin's more general policy towards the Islamic world – but they were not sure how to treat their Krymchak and Karaite neighbours. After a meeting with Ohlendorf in Simferopol in late 1941, two Wehrmacht officers, *Oberkriegsverwaltungsrat* Fritz Donner and Major Ernst Seifert, reported that it was interesting to note that 'a large part of these Jews on the Crimea is of the Mohammedan faith', while there were also 'Near Eastern racial groups of a non-Semitic character, who, strangely, have adopted the Jewish faith'.³¹ The confusion among the Germans about the classification of Karaites and Krymchaks was striking. In the end, the Karaites were classified as ethnically Turkic and spared, while the Krymchaks were considered ethnically Jewish and killed. According to Walter Groß, the Karaites were exempt from persecution because of their close social relations with the allied Muslim Tatars.³² A report by *Einsatzgruppe D* of May 1942 underlined this view, emphasizing the bonds between the Crimea's Muslims and the Karaites, bonds which had been furthered by 'their common anti-Bolshevik stance'.³³

Many Karaites were even recruited into the Crimean Tatar volunteer units, which the Wehrmacht and SS had established to fight partisans across the peninsula. When the Germans abandoned the Crimea in spring 1944, many of these Karaite volunteers, alongside Tatar recruits and some Tatar and Karaite civilians, followed the Wehrmacht westward, as they feared Soviet retaliation.

In autumn 1944, according to a report by Gerhard Klopfer, Bormann's State Secretary of the NSDAP Party Chancellery, to Himmler's chief of staff, Karl Brandt, 500 to 600 Karaites were fighting in the defence of the Reich; Klopfer explained that 'in respect to the close relations between the Crimean Tatars and the Crimean Karaites' no measures were to be taken against the Karaites.³⁴ Many of the Karaite and Crimean Tatar refugees ended up in Vienna in 1944. To demonstrate their closeness to the Crimean Muslims and Islam, the Karaites applied to the German authorities to set up an 'Association of Tatars and Karaites in Vienna' (*Verein der Tataren und Karaimen zu Wien*), later changing this name to 'Tatar Association in Vienna' (*Verein der Tataren zu Wien*) and then to 'Islamic Alliance' (*Islamische Allianz*).³⁵ They survived the war. It should, however, be noted that in some areas outside the Crimea, Karaite families who lived close to Jewish communities were killed nevertheless, most notably during the massacres in Kiev (Babi Yar) and Krasnodar.

The Judeo-Tats, or 'Mountain Jews', in the Caucasus, a minority of Iranian ancestry, provoked similar debates among the Germans. When the Wehrmacht advanced into the northern Caucasus in the summer and autumn of 1942, 3,000 Judeo-Tats came under Nazi control.³⁶ As *Einsatzgruppe D* began killing the Jewish population in the Caucasus, it initially also murdered many Judeo-Tats, considering them Jewish. In the autumn of 1942, the Judeo-Tats took their case to the German authorities. The question of their fate caused lengthy discussions, both in Berlin and on the ground. In Germany, the issue was debated by officials, bureaucrats and experts from various parts of the regime together with the question about the status of Sardari's Jugutis. Various expert reports were commissioned. One consulted specialist, Friedrich Wilhelm Euler, responsible for Jewish affairs at the Reich Institute for the History of the New Germany in Munich, argued that the Judeo-Tats were a rural, warrior-like mountain people who had for centuries had no contact to Jewish groups, and should be treated differently than Jews.³⁷ Another report, written a few months later by the notorious anti-Semitic race theorist Gerhard Kittel, who worked for both the Institute for the Study of the Jewish Question and the Reich Institute for the History of the New Germany, also argued that the group shared the customs and culture of their neighbouring (predominantly Muslim) mountain communities and had no connections to 'world Judaism', and so had to be exempt from persecution.³⁸ Walter Groß was sceptical, responding to both reports that investigations on the ground had to be made before a definite statement was possible.³⁹ At this point, however, it was too late for such investigations, as German troops had already pulled out of the Caucasus.

The discussion among the regime's bureaucrats back in Germany had, in any case, little actual impact on the ground. Here, prompted by the request of the Judeo-Tats, the SS had already engaged in investigations, visiting houses, attending celebrations, and enquiring into the customs of the community.

In fact, *SS-Oberführer* Walther Bierkamp, then head of *Einsatzgruppe D*, had personally visited a village of the 'mountain Jews' in the Nalchik area, who had shown themselves to be extremely hospitable.⁴⁰ Bierkamp quickly became convinced that, aside from their religion, they had nothing in common with Jews. At the same time, he recognized Islamic influence, as the Tats also practiced polygamous relationships. Bierkamp gave the order that these peoples were not to be harmed, and that, in place of 'Mountain Jews', the term 'Tats' had to be used. Although the Germans had killed some Judeo-Tats in the early weeks of the occupation, the majority survived.

III

Finally, the Nazi murder of Europe's gypsies also involved Muslims. As the Germans began screening the occupied territories of the Soviet Union for the Roma population, they soon encountered many Muslim Roma.⁴¹ Indeed, the majority of the Crimea's Roma population was Islamic.⁴² They had for centuries assimilated with the Tatars, who now showed remarkable solidarity with their co-religionists. Muslim representatives, organized into so-called 'Muslim committees' that the Germans had established across the peninsula in early 1942 – with a central Muslim committee in Simferopol – to administer the religious minority, stepped in, sending petitions to the Germans to ask for the protection of the Muslim Roma. An article about them by a certain N. Seidametov, published in the Tatar propaganda paper *Azat Kirim* on 27 March 1942, explained that the group distinguished itself from the ordinary 'gypsies' in its 'language, rituals and manners', and was ethnically related to 'Iranian tribes'.⁴³ Backed by the Tatars, many Muslim Roma pretended to be Tatars to escape deportation and death. Some employed Islam. A remarkable example was the roundup of Roma in Simferopol in December 1941, when those captured tried to use religious symbols to convince the Germans that their arrest was a mistake. An eyewitness noted in his diary:

The gypsies arrived en masse on carriages at the Talmud-Thora Building. For some reason, they raised a green flag, the symbol of Islam, high and put a mullah at the head of their procession. The gypsies tried to convince the Germans that they were not gypsies; some claimed to be Tatars, others to be Turkmens. But their protests were disregarded and they were all put into the great building.⁴⁴

In the end, many Muslim Roma were murdered. Nevertheless, as the Germans had trouble distinguishing Muslim Roma from Muslim Tatars, some – most estimates suggest 30 per cent – survived and, as with the Karaites, a number of Muslim Roma were even recruited into German Tatar auxiliary units.

During his interrogation at the Nuremberg *Einsatzgruppen* Trial, when asked about the persecution of 'gypsies' in the Crimea, Otto Ohlendorf explained that the screening had been complicated by the fact that many Roma and the Crimean Tatars had shared the same religion: 'That was the difficulty, because some of the gypsies – if not all of them – were Moslems, and for that reason we attached a great amount of importance [to the issue] to not getting into difficulties with the Tartars and, therefore, people were employed in this task who knew the places and the people.'⁴⁵ Furthermore, there is some evidence that also some non-Muslim Roma tried to portray themselves as Muslim Tatars in order to escape persecution. One Russian eye-witness, Kh. G. Lashkevich, who was living in Simferopol, recorded in his diary a conversation he had with a Roma, who had survived the roundup off gypsies in Simferopol. The Roma had told him:

I was already in the truck with my daughter and we were waiting to be sent off. When I saw a Tatar acquaintance of mine talking to the Germans, I shouted at him: 'Save me, tell the Germans that I'm not a Gypsy, but a Tatar, after all we're friends.' And the Tatar began to tell the Germans that I wasn't a Gypsy, but a Turkmen, and they let me and my daughter out. Then I began to plead for them to release my wife and my other children and grandchildren, who were sitting in the other trucks. But the other Roma, seeing that I had been let out, began to shout all at once that they weren't Roma, but also Turkmen like me, and begged to be released. Then my friend, the Tatar, said to me: 'better to save yourself. You won't save your family anyway, and they'll take you back into the truck, and I'll catch hell for protecting you.' So I ran away with my daughter, and my wife and all my children and grandchildren perished.⁴⁶

Muslims in the Balkans were also affected by the persecution of the Roma, as there were many Roma of the Islamic faith. The Ustaša state engaged in brutal repression and persecution of its Roma population, initially also targeting the largely settled Muslim Roma of Bosnia and Herzegovina, the so-called 'white gypsies'.⁴⁷

In the summer of 1941, many Muslim Roma complained to the Islamic religious authorities about their discrimination, and a delegation of leading Muslim representatives petitioned the state that Muslim Roma should be considered part of the Muslim community and that any attack on them would be considered an attack on the Islamic community. Eager to integrate Muslims into the Croatian state, Ustaša authorities promptly excluded Muslim Roma from persecution and deportation. 'It has been ordered that the so-called white Gypsies – Muslims – must not be touched as these must be considered to be

Aryan. Thus no measures whatsoever must be applied to them, even order to be implemented against Gypsies', the official Ustaša decree of August 1941 read.⁴⁸

The protection of the 'white gypsies' led to a wave of conversions of Christian Roma to Islam; and these acts, too, as in the case of Jewish conversions, were eventually prohibited by the Interior Ministry in Zagreb. Moreover, there were cases of non-Muslim Roma who were beginning to wear fezzes to avoid deportation, and here, too, as in the Jewish case, Ustaša authorities intervened, in the summer of 1942, warning officials by decree about this development.⁴⁹ Throughout the war, the *Ulema-Medžlis*, the highest Islamic council in the Croatian state, showed concern about the safety of Muslim Roma and repeatedly complained to the authorities in Zagreb about arrests of 'white gypsies'. Prompted by Fehim Spaho, the Ustaša government even intervened on behalf of Muslim Roma in German occupied Serbia, urging the German officials there not to persecute Muslims as gypsies.⁵⁰ Also in Macedonia and Albania, where the majority of Roma were Muslim, their religious affiliation gave them some protection. Perhaps the most famous case is that of the Roma of Mitrovica: when the Albanian police chief of the city was ordered by the authorities to round up the gypsies, he told them that there were no gypsies in Mitrovica, only Muslims.⁵¹

IV

The previous pages have illustrated the entanglement of Muslims, Jews and Roma during the Holocaust. In many of the regions invaded during the Second World War, German forces encountered mixed Muslim–Jewish and Muslim–Roma populations and faced difficulties distinguishing between these groups. In fact, in all of these regions discussions began about the correct classification of individuals and groups as 'Muslim', 'Jew', or 'Roma'. In some of these areas, where Jewish or Roma populations lived closely together with Muslims, this proximity could help individuals and groups to escape persecution by arguing that they were Muslim and/or by being categorized as Islamic by Axis authorities. It is impossible to establish the numbers of Jews and Roma who survived this way. This essay can only provide a brief overview, giving a broad brush-stroke picture of these intertwined stories; future research will have to examine this picture in more depth.

On a more general level, this chapter has shown how blurred the lines between different population groups could be, and how arbitrary German definitions and categorizations of populations were during the years of the Holocaust. The Nazi regime had adopted a clear policy towards Muslims, exempting them from persecution and indeed seeking to secure them as allies. Its bureaucrats had initially not considered that the (religiously defined) population group ('Muslims'), which was to be won over as allies could overlap with (racially defined) population groups ('Jews' and 'Roma') which were to be

persecuted. At times, questions about whether a population group was to be considered Islamic, Jewish or Roma could cause long and heated debates about religion, race and political strategy, not just on the ground but also in Berlin, involving experts, officials and functionaries from all parts of the regime. Islam was thereby a crucial category of classification – a category that could decide between life and death.

Similar contradictions and dilemmas can be observed in other areas of the regime's policies regarding population classifications. The earliest and most famous case of such debates was about the classification of Jews in the Reich. Centuries of assimilation and intermarriage had made the German Jewish population an integral part of the majority society, and distinguishing between 'Jews' and 'Germans' was often complicated and caused long debates about racial and religious classifications. Many so-called 'partial-Jews' (Jewish *Mischlinge*) – Germans who had one or two Jewish grandparents but who were not part of the religious Jewish community, and who were not married to Jews – were exempt from persecution.⁵² Jewish *Mischlinge*, who did practice Judaism or were married to Jews, were considered *Geltungsjuden* and persecuted. In practice, investigations into the Jewish identity of Germans were often inconsistent; in the end, some Jewish Germans and many Jewish *Mischlinge* even fought in the Wehrmacht and the SS.⁵³ In the occupied territories, under wartime conditions, discussions about the classification of population groups were often even more arbitrary, although Nazi authorities in the field tended to categorize people as Jewish whenever they were in doubt. And German officials faced similar difficulties with population categorizations during the enforced 'Germanization' of the Eastern territories, most notably in Poland, where distinctions between *Volksfremde* and 'Germans' were often inconsistent, pragmatic and ad hoc.⁵⁴ In short, Nazi Germany's population policies, as drawn up by bureaucrats in Berlin, were regularly complicated by the situation on the ground. The debates about the distinctions between Muslims, Jews and Roma are part of this broader story, a story that has, so far, never been systematically studied as one phenomenon.

Overall, this essay has shown that the history of Muslims – a population group long marginalized in research on the Second World War and the Holocaust – was at times intimately intertwined with the history of the Holocaust. It thus adds not only an important dimension to the history of the Holocaust, but also to the history of Muslim–Jewish relations in the modern age.

Notes

1. On these executions and the internal discussion about them, see Raul Hilberg, *The Destruction of the European Jews* (London: W. H. Allen, 1961), 222–223; and, in the revised edition, Idem, *The Destruction of the European Jews*, 3 vols. (New York: Holmes and Meier, 1985), vol. 1, 338–339; Hans-Adolf Jacobsen, 'The Kommissarbefehl and Mass Executions of Soviet Russian Prisoners of War,' in Martin Broszat et al.

- (eds.), *Anatomy of the SS State* (London: Collins, 1968), 505–535, 529–530; Christian Streit, *Keine Kameraden: Die Wehrmacht und die sowjetischen Kriegsgefangenen 1941–1945* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1978), 98; Reinhard Otto, *Wehrmacht, Gestapo und sowjetische Kriegsgefangene im deutschen Reichsgebiet 1941/42* (Munich: Oldenbourg, 1998), 66 and 181; and the memoirs of Otto Bräutigam, *So hat es sich zugetragen: Ein Leben als Soldat und Diplomat* (Würzburg: Holzner, 1968), 390–393; and Hans von Herwarth, *Zwischen Hitler und Stalin: Erlebte Zeitgeschichte 1931 bis 1945* (Frankfurt M: Propyläen, 1982), 233; and for the English version, Idem, *Against Two Evils* (London: Rawson, Wade, 1981), 205.
2. Quoted in Streit, *Keine Kameraden*, 98; and in Otto, *Wehrmacht, Gestapo und sowjetische Kriegsgefangene im deutschen Reichsgebiet*, 66.
 3. Bundesarchiv, Berlin-Lichterfelde (BA), R 6/634, East Ministry, Decree ('Erlass betr. Bestimmung des Begriffs "Jude" in den besetzten Ostgebieten'), May 1942.
 4. David Motadel, *Islam and Nazi Germany's War* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2014).
 5. Joseph B. Schechtman, *The Mufti and the Fuehrer: The Rise and Fall of Haj Amin el-Husseini* (London: Thomas Yoseloff, 1965), 154–159; Jennie Lebel, *The Mufti of Jerusalem Haj-Amin El-Husseini and National-Socialism* (Belgrade: Cigoja, 2007), 246–255; Klaus Gensicke, *The Mufti of Jerusalem and the Nazis: The Berlin Years, 1941–1945* (London: Vallentine Mitchell, 2011), 117–129. An overview of the literature on al-Husayni is given by Gerhard Höpp, 'Der Gefangene im Dreieck: Zum Bild Amin al-Husseinis in Wissenschaft und Publizistik seit 1941: Ein Bio-Bibliographischer Abriß,' in Rainer Zimmer-Winkel (ed.), *Eine umstrittene Figur: Hadj Amin al-Husseini, Mufti von Jerusalem* (Trier: Aphorisma, 1999), 5–23. A more general account of Nazi Germany's anti-Jewish propaganda in Arabic is Jeffrey Herf, *Nazi Propaganda to the Arab World* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2009).
 6. There is a vast body of literature on the subject. See, for instance, on Iraq, Peter Wien, *Iraqi Arab Nationalism: Authoritarian, Totalitarian and Pro-Fascist Inclinations, 1932–1941* (London: Routledge, 2006); on Palestine, Nezam Al-Abbasi, 'Die palästinensische Freiheitsbewegung im Spiegel ihrer Presse von 1929 bis 1945' (Ph.D. dissertation, Freiburg, 1981); René Wildangel, *Zwischen Achse und Mandatsmacht: Palästina und der Nationalsozialismus* (Berlin: Klaus Schwarz, 2007); on Lebanon and Syria, Götz Nordbruch, *Nazism in Syria and Lebanon: The Ambivalence of the German Option, 1933–1945* (London: Routledge, 2009); on Egypt, Edmond Cao-Van-Hoa, "Der Feind meines Feindes...": *Darstellungen des nationalsozialistischen Deutschland in ägyptischen Schriften* (Frankfurt M: Peter Lang, 1990); Israel Gershoni and James Jankowski, *Confronting Fascism and Egypt: Dictatorship versus Democracy in the 1930s* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2010); Israel Gershoni and Götz Nordbruch, *Sympathie und Schrecken: Begegnungen mit Faschismus und Nationalsozialismus in Ägypten, 1922–1937* (Berlin: Klaus Schwarz, 2011); and the contributions in Israel Gershoni (ed.), *Arab Responses to Fascism and Nazism: Attraction and Repulsion* (Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 2014); on the post-war memory, Gilbert Achcar, *The Arabs and the Holocaust* (London: Saqi, 2010); see also the historiographical reviews of the literature on perceptions and influences of Nazism in the Arab world by Peter Wien, 'Coming to Terms with the Past: German Academia and Historical Relations between the Arab Lands and Nazi Germans,' *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, 42: 2 (2010), 311–321; and Götz Nordbruch, "'Cultural Fusion" of Thought and Ambitions? Memory, Politics and the History of Arab-Nazi German Encounters,' *Middle Eastern Studies*, 47: 1 (2011), 183–194.

7. There are a number of studies that have pointed to individual cases of Muslims in North Africa and the Balkans who helped their Jewish compatriots during the years of Vichy, Fascist and Nazi persecution, see Robert Satloff, *Among the Righteous: Lost Stories from the Holocaust's Long Reach into Arab Lands* (New York: Public Affairs, 2006); Norman Gershman, *Besa: Muslims who saved Jews in World War II* (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 2008).
8. On the Holocaust in France, see Michael R. Marrus and Robert O. Paxton, *Vichy France and the Jews* (New York: Basic Books, 1981); Jacques Adler, *The Jews of Paris and the Final Solution: Communal Response and Internal Conflicts, 1940–1944* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1987); Susan Zuccotti, *The Holocaust, the French, and the Jews* (New York: Basic Books, 1993); Renée Poznanski, *Jews in France During World War II* (Waltham, MA: Brandeis University Press, 2001); Adam Rayski, *The Choice of the Jews Under Vichy: Between Submission and Resistance* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2005); Ahlrich Meyer, *Täter im Verhör: Die 'Endlösung der Judenfrage' in Frankreich 1940–1944* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2005), 380; on the occupation more generally, Julian T. Jackson, *France: The Dark Years, 1940–1944* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001); Robert Gildea, *Marianne in Chains: In Search of the German Occupation 1940–1945* (London: Macmillan, 2002); Richard Vinen, *The Unfree French: Life under the Occupation* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2006).
9. Alain Boyer, *L'Institut Musulman de la Mosquée de Paris* (Paris: Cheam, 1992), 19–33; Michel Renard, 'Gratitude, Contrôle, Accompagnement: Le Traitement du Religieux Islamique en Métropole (1914–1950),' *Bulletin de l'Institut d'Histoire du Temps Présent*, 83 (2004), 54–69; Idem, 'Les Débuts de la Présence Musulmane en France et son Encadrement,' in Mohammed Arkoun (ed.), *Histoire de l'Islam et des Musulmans en France du Moyen Age à Nos Jours* (Paris: Albin Michel, 2006), 712–740, 718–730; as well as the general studies by Pascal Le Pautremat, *La Politique Musulmane de la France au XXe Siècle: De l'Hexagone aux Terres d'Islam* (Paris: Maisonneuve et Larose, 2003), 333–342; Sadek Sellam, *La France et ses Musulmans: Un siècle de politique musulmane (1895–2005)* (Paris: Fayard, 2006), 171–184; and Naomi Davidson, *Only Muslim: Embodying Islam in Twentieth-Century France* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2012), 36–61, provide studies of the Paris mosque and its rector, Si Kaddour Benghabrit; see also biographical studies of Benghabrit by Jalila Sbaï, 'Trajectoire d'un homme et d'une idée: Si Kaddour Ben Ghabrit et l'Islam de France, 1892–1926,' *Hespéris Tamuda*, 39 : 1 (2001), 45–58; and Hamza Ben Driss Ottmani, *Kaddour Benghabrit: Un Maghrébin hors du commun* (Rabat: Marsam, 2010).
10. Politisches Archiv des Auswärtigen Amts, Berlin (hereafter PA-AA), R 40747, Schleier (German Embassy Paris) to German Foreign Office, 8 February 1941.
11. The debate about the role of the Paris mosque in supporting Jews and members of the resistance began with an article of Albert Assouline, 'Une vocation ignorée de la mosquée de Paris,' *Almanach du Combattant* (1983), 123–124. Assouline's claim that 1732 resistance fighters, many of them Jews, found refuge in the mosque has been proven incorrect. The most notable accounts that portray the Paris mosque as a shelter for Jews are Mohammed Aïssaoui, *L'Étoile Jaune et le Croissant* (Paris: Gallimard, 2012); and Satloff, *Among the Righteous*, 139–158. Ethan Katz, 'Did the Paris Mosque save Jews? A Mystery and its Memory,' *Jewish Quarterly Review*, 102: 2 (2012), 256–287, esp. 270–283, provides a more nuanced and complex account.
12. Quoted in Katz, 'Did the Paris Mosque save Jews?', 276.
13. Susan Bachrach, 'Abdol Hossein Sardari (1895–1981),' in United States Holocaust Memorial Museum (ed.), *Holocaust Encyclopedia*, Online, provides the most solid

- published account of the case. Ahmad Mahrad, 'Das Schicksal jüdischer Iraner in den vom nationalsozialistischen Deutschen Reich eroberten europäischen Gebieten' (Unpublished Study, The Hague, Winter 1975/1976), translated as Idem, 'The Fate of Jewish Iranians in European Territories conquered by the Third German Reich' (Unpublished Study, The Hague, Winter 1975/1976), was the first study of the case; a shortened version was later published as Ahmad Mahrad, 'Das Schicksal jüdischer Iraner in den vom nationalsozialistischen Deutschen Reich eroberten europäischen Gebieten,' *Orient: Zeitschrift des deutschen Orient-Instituts*, 26: 3 (1985), 407–425. A hagiographical account of Sardari is provided by Fariborz Mokhtari, *In the Lion's Shadow: The Iranian Schindler and His Homeland in the Second World War* (Stroud: History, 2011). On Iran and Nazi Germany more generally, see Djalal Madani, *Iranische Politik und Drittes Reich* (Frankfurt M: Peter Lang, 1986).
14. PA-AA, R 99422, Sardari to Krafft (German Embassy Paris), 12 August 1942.
 15. PA-AA, R 99422, Anonymous (Sardari), Memorandum ('Les Iraniens de confessions mosaïque'), n.d. (1942).
 16. PA-AA, R 99422, Anonymous (Sardari), List ('Liste des Iraniens de Confession Mosaïque demeurant à Paris et les environs'), n.d. (1942).
 17. PA-AA, R 99422, Eichmann (Reich Security Main Office) to Klingenfuss (German Foreign Office), 8 December 1942.
 18. PA-AA, R 99422, Groß (NSDAP Office of Race Politics) to German Foreign Office, 7 January 1943.
 19. PA-AA, R 99422, Sardari to Krafft, 29 September 1942; PA-AA, R 99422, Sardari to Krafft, 17 March 1943; PA-AA, R 99422, Swiss Legation in Germany to German Foreign Office, 11 March 1943.
 20. PA-AA, R 99422, Sardari, List ('Liste de Iraniens de Confession Mosaïque de nationalité iranienne d'origine demeurant à Paris et les environ'), n.d. (17 March 1943).
 21. PA-AA, R 99422, Schulenburg (German Foreign Office), Internal Note, 14 April 1943.
 22. PA-AA, R 99422, Thadden (German Foreign Office) to Eichmann, 29 April 1943. This was also forwarded by Thadden to the German Embassy Paris (and copies to FO agencies in Brussels, The Hague, Prague, Cracow and Riga), 7 May 1943, PA-AA, R 99422.
 23. PA-AA, R 99422, Thadden, Internal Note, 26 May 1943.
 24. PA-AA, R 99422, Thadden to Eichmann, 9 June 1943. This was forwarded to the German embassy in Paris, and the German diplomatic offices in Brussels, The Hague, Prague, Cracow and Riga.
 25. Robert Assaraf, *Mohammed V et les Juifs du Maroc à l'époque de Vichy* (Paris: Plon, 1997).
 26. On the Second World War in the Balkans, see Jozo Tomasevich, *War and Revolution in Yugoslavia, 1941–1945: Occupation and Collaboration* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2001); for Muslim-populated Bosnia and Herzegovina, Enver Redžić, *Bosnia and Herzegovina in the Second World War* (London: Frank Cass, 2005); Idem, *Muslimansko Autonomashtvo i 13. SS Divizija: Autonomija Bosne i Hercegovine i Hitlerov Treći Rajh (The Muslim Autonomist Movement and the 13th SS Division: Bosnia Herzegovina's Autonomy and Hitler's Third Reich)* (Sarajevo: Svjetlost, 1987); Marko Attila Hoare, *The Bosnian Muslims in the Second World War: A History* (London: Hurst, 2013); for Albania, Bernd J. Fischer, *Albania at War 1939–1945* (London: Hurst, 1999); Hubert Neuwirth, *Widerstand und Kollaboration in Albanien 1939–1944* (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 2008).
 27. On Jewish conversions to Islam, see Tomasevich, *War and Revolution in Yugoslavia*, 543–544; Redžić, *Bosnia and Herzegovina in the Second World War*, 78 and 172;

- Idem, *Muslimansko Autonomastvo i 13. SS Divizija*, 20; Yeshayahu Jelinek, 'Nationalities and Minorities in the Independent State of Croatia,' *Nationalities Papers*, 8: 2 (1980), 195–210, 201; Idem, 'Bosnia-Herzegovina at War: Relations between Moslems and Non-Moslems,' *Holocaust and Genocide Studies*, 5: 3 (1990), 275–292, 284 and 286–287; Emily Greble, *Sarajevo, 1941–1945: Muslims, Christians, and Jews in Hitler's Europe* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2011), esp. 17, 93–97, 112–113, 115, 117–118, 120–121, 124–125 and 243; Robert J. Donia, *Sarajevo: A Biography* (London: Hurst, 2006), 174 and 176–179; more generally on the politics of conversion in the Ustaša state, Mark Biondich, 'Religion and Nation in Wartime Croatia: Reflections on the Ustaša Policy of Forced Religious Conversions, 1941–1942,' *The Slavonic and East European Review*, 83: 1 (2005), 71–116.
28. Donia, *Sarajevo*, 178–179.
 29. On the German occupation of the Caucasus and the Crimea, see Alexander Dallin, *German Rule in Russia, 1941–1945: A Study of Occupation Policies* (London: Macmillan, 1957), 226–252 (Caucasus) and 253–275 (Crimea); Patrik von zur Mühlen, *Zwischen Hakenkreuz und Sowjetstern: Der Nationalismus der Sowjetischen Orientvölker im Zweiten Weltkrieg* (Düsseldorf: Droste, 1971), 189–193 (Caucasus) and 183–187 (Crimea); Andrej Angrick, *Besatzungspolitik und Massenmord: Die Einsatzgruppe D in der Südlichen Sowjetunion 1941–1943* (Hamburg: Hamburger Edition, 2003), 545–715 (Caucasus) and 323–361 and 452–544 (Crimea). On the German occupation of the Crimea in particular, see Michel Luther, 'Die Krim unter deutscher Besetzung im Zweiten Weltkrieg,' *Forschungen zur Osteuropäischen Geschichte*, 3 (1956), 28–98; Norbert Kunz, *Die Krim unter Deutscher Herrschaft 1941–1944: Germanisierungstoptie und Besatzungsrealität* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2005). On the German occupation of the Caucasus in particular, see Joachim Hoffmann, *Kaukasien 1942/43: Das deutsche Heer und Orientvoelker der Sowjetunion* (Freiburg: Rombach, 1991).
 30. On the Karaites and Krymchaks, see Rudolf Loewenthal, 'The Extinction of the Krimchaks in World War II,' *American Slavic and East European Review*, 10; 2 (1951), 130–136; Mühlen, *Zwischen Hakenkreuz und Sowjetstern*, 49–51; Warren Green, 'The Fate of the Crimean Jewish Communities: Ashkenazim, Krimchaks and Karaites,' *Jewish Social Studies*, 46: 2 (1984), 169–176; Angrick, *Besatzungspolitik und Massenmord*, 326–331; Kunz, *Die Krim unter Deutscher Herrschaft*, 187–194; Kiril Feferman, 'Nazi Germany and the Karaites in 1938–1944: Between Racial Theory and Realpolitik,' *Nationalities Papers*, 39: 2 (2011), 277–294.
 31. Bundesarchiv-Militärarchiv, Freiburg (hereafter BA-MA), MFB 4/44423, Donner and Seifert, Report ('Bericht über die Erkundung der Siedlungsmöglichkeiten in der Nogaischen Steppe (Taurien) und der Halbinsel Krim'), 10 March 1942.
 32. BA, NS 31/33, Klopfer (NSDAP Party Chancellery) to Brandt (Hitler's Staff), 27 September 1944.
 33. Feferman, 'Nazi Germany and the Karaites,' 288.
 34. Quoted in Green, 'The Fate of the Crimean Jewish Communities,' 173–174.
 35. Feferman, 'Nazi Germany and the Karaites,' 285–286 and 289.
 36. On the Judeo-Tats, see Dallin, *German Rule in Russia*, 247; Mühlen, *Zwischen Hakenkreuz und Sowjetstern*, 49–50; Hoffmann, *Kaukasien*, 439; Philipp-Christian Wachs, *Der Fall Theodor Oberländer (1905–1998): Ein Lehrstück deutscher Geschichte* (Frankfurt M: Campus, 2000), 119–121; Angrick, *Besatzungspolitik und Massenmord*, 612; Kiril Feferman, 'Nazi Germany and the Mountain Jews: Was there a Policy?' *Holocaust and Genocide Studies*, 21: 1 (2007), 96–114; more generally, Rudolf Loewenthal, 'The Judeo-Tats in the Caucasus,' *Historia Judaica*, 14 (1952), 61–82, 79.

37. PA-AA, R 99422, Euler (Reich Institute for the History of the New Germany), Report ('Die Abstammung der kaukasischen und georgischen Angehörigen des mosaischen Bekenntnisses'), 23 October 1942. The report was sent to Groß and also to the German Interior Ministry; PA-AA, R 99422, Klingenfuß to NSDAP Office of Race Politics, 6 November 1942; PA-AA, R 99422, Klingenfuß to German Interior Ministry, 19 November 1942.
38. PA-AA, R 99422, Kittel (University of Vienna), Report ('Über die persischen, afghanischen und kaukasischen Juden'), 16 February 1943.
39. PA-AA, R 99422, Groß to German Interior Ministry, 24 May 1943. This report was also sent to the German Foreign Office, see PA-AA, R 99422, Groß to German Foreign Office, 24 May 1943. Apparently unaware that Groß had sent everything to the German Foreign Office, the German Interior Ministry also forwarded Groß's letter and Kittel's report to the German Foreign Office, see PA-AA, R 99422, Feldscher (German Interior Ministry) to German Foreign Office, 23 June 1943. The German Foreign Office also informed the head of the Sipo and SD. Groß had already raised the same scepticism when receiving Euler's report, explaining on 7 January 1943 that he would in the future draw up a conclusive statement, see PA-AA, R 99422, Groß to German Foreign Office, 7 January 1943.
40. BA, R 6/65, Bräutigam (Liaison Officer of the East Ministry at Army Group South) to East Ministry, 26 December 1942; Institut für Zeitgeschichte, Munich (IfZ), ZS 400, Bräutigam, Report ('Als Bevollmächtigter des Ostministeriums bei der Heeresgruppe Süd'), n.d. (post-1945).
41. Martin Holler, *Der Nationalsozialistische Völkermord an den Roma in der besetzten Sowjetunion (1941–1944)* (Heidelberg: Dokumentations- und Kulturzentrum Deutscher Sinti und Roma, 2009), 78–101 (Crimea) and 101–107 (North Caucasus); Mikhail Tyaglyy, 'Were the "Chingené" Victims of the Holocaust? Nazi Policy toward the Crimean Roma, 1941–1944,' *Holocaust and Genocide Studies* 23: 1 (2009), 26–53.
42. Holler, *Der Nationalsozialistische Völkermord an den Roma in der besetzten Sowjetunion*, 91–101; and Tyaglyy, 'Were the "Chingené" Victims of the Holocaust?' 37–39, 41 and 43–44, provide overviews of the history of Muslim Roma in the Crimea and the role of the Tatar population during their persecution.
43. Quoted in Holler, *Der Nationalsozialistische Völkermord an den Roma in der besetzten Sowjetunion*, 92; and, in a slightly different translation, in Tyaglyy, 'Were the "Chingené" Victims of the Holocaust?' 37.
44. Quoted in Holler, *Der Nationalsozialistische Völkermord an den Roma in der besetzten Sowjetunion*, 92.
45. Ohlendorf Testimony ('Extracts from the Testimony of Defendant Ohlendorf'), in *Trials of War Criminals before the Nuernberg Military Tribunals under Control Council Law No. 10*, 15 vols. (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1949–1953), vol. 4 (*The Einsatzgruppen Case*), 223–312, 290.
46. Quoted in Tyaglyy, 'Were the "Chingené" Victims of the Holocaust?' 38–39.
47. On Muslim Roma in the Ustaša state, see Tomasevich, *War and Revolution in Yugoslavia*, 609; Narcis Lengel-Krizman, 'Prilog proucavanju terora u tzv. NDH: Sudbina Roma 1941–1945' ('A Contribution to the Study of the Terror in the so-called Independent State of Croatia: The Fate of the Roma 1941–1945'), *Casopis za suvremenu povijest* 1 (1986), 29–42, 33–34; Michael Zimmermann, *Rassenutopie und Genozid: Die nationalsozialistische "Lösung der Zigeunerfrage"* (Hamburg: Christians, 1996), 285; Karola Fings, Cordula Lissner and Frank Sparing, '...einziges Land, in dem Judenfrage und Zigeunerfrage gelöst': *Die Verfolgung der Roma im faschistisch besetzten Jugoslawien 1941–1945* (Cologne: Rom, 1992), 20; Donald Kenrick and Grattan

- Puxon, *Gypsies under the Swastika* (Hatfield: University of Hertfordshire Press, 2009), 99 and 101; Mark Biondich, 'Persecution of Roma-Sinti in Croatia, 1941–1945,' in Paul A. Shapiro and Robert M. Ehrenreich (eds.), *Roma and Sinti: Under-Studied Victims of Nazism* (Washington, DC: Center for Advanced Holocaust Studies, 2002), 33–47, 37–38; Jelinek, 'Nationalities and Minorities,' 200; Idem, 'Bosnia-Herzegovina at War,' 286 and 289; Greble, *Sarajevo*, 17, 90–93, 95, 117–118, 121 and 125; on German views of the 'white gypsies', Sevasti Trubeta, "'Gypsiness", Racial Discourse and Persecution: Balkan Roma during the Second World War,' *Nationalities Papers*, 31: 4 (2003), 495–514, 505–506.
48. Quoted in Kenrick and Puxon, *Gypsies under the Swastika*, 101.
 49. Idem.
 50. On Muslim Roma in Serbia, see Zimmermann, *Rassenutopie und Genozid*, 249; Fings, Lissner and Sparing, '... einziges Land, in dem Judenfrage und Zigeunerfrage gelöst,' 46 and 116–117 (documents).
 51. On Muslim Roma in Albania and Macedonia, see Fings, Lissner and Sparing, '... einziges Land, in dem Judenfrage und Zigeunerfrage gelöst,' 43–46; Donald Kenrick and Grattan Puxon, *The Destiny of Europe's Gypsies* (London: Chatto, 1972), 119–123; Idem, *Gypsies under the Swastika*, 74–77 and 97.
 52. Beate Meyer, "*Jüdische Mischlinge*": *Rassenpolitik und Verfolgungserfahrung 1933–1945* (Hamburg: Dölling und Galitz, 1999); James F. Tent, *In the Shadow of the Holocaust: Nazi Persecution of Jewish-Christian Germans* (Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas, 2003).
 53. Bryan Mark Rigg, *Hitler's Jewish Soldiers: The Untold Story of Nazi Racial Laws and Men of Jewish Descent in the German Military* (Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas, 2002); for oral history interviews with some of these men, see Idem, *Lives of Hitler's Jewish Soldiers: Untold Tales of Men of Jewish Descent who fought for the Third Reich* (Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas, 2009).
 54. Gerhard Wolf, *Ideologie und Herrschaftsrationalität: Nationalsozialistische Germanisierungspolitik in Polen* (Hamburg: Hamburger Edition, 2012); see also, more generally, Isabel Heinemann, *Rasse, Siedlung, deutsches Blut: Das Rasse- und Siedlungshauptamt der SS und die rassenpolitische Neuordnung Europas* (Göttingen: Wallstein, 2003).