

Ivo Goldstein, *Antisemitizam u Hrvatskoj od srednjega vijeka do danas [Anti-Semitism in Croatia from the Middle Ages to the Present]* (Zagreb: Fraktura and the “Bet Israel” Jewish Religious Community in Croatia, Zaprešić and Zagreb, 2022), 632 pages

Mirjana KASAPOVIĆ

Where is Croatia?

The book by Ivo Goldstein is a thematically, theoretically, and methodologically demanding work. Anti-Semitism is explored in academic literature as a political ideology, political and social movement, and state policy, either within a country or comparatively within several countries. Goldstein decided to research anti-Semitism in one land. I am deliberately writing land and not country because Croatia, for most of its history since the Middle Ages, has not been an independent country, but rather Croatian lands were incorporated in various state structures – the Habsburg Monarchy, Venetian Republic, Ottoman Empire, Republic of Dubrovnik, France, Italy, Hungary, Yugoslavia – in which there were more or less significant geographical, ethnic, cultural and political entities. One can only speak of country from 1941 to 1945 (Independent State of Croatia) and after 1992 (Republic of Croatia). Goldstein solved this problem by quietly “entering” the contemporary Republic of Croatia into history and treating the Croatian lands that were in the medieval and modern age in the composition of various state structures, and today a part of the Republic of Croatia, as areas of Croatia.

This means that, for example, anti-Semitism in Austro-Hungarian Varaždin, Sisak, and Zagreb was treated as anti-Semitism in Croatia. Such an approach is pragmatic, but not unproblematic. As anti-Semitism was and remains state policy, the question of to whom state-generated or sponsored anti-Semitism in the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy should be attributed. Is that not Austrian and Hungarian, not Croatian anti-Semitism? The opposite is also true: are not non-discriminatory state legal acts concerning Jews, such as the *Edict of Toleration* of Emperor Joseph II, Austrian, and not Croatian documents? The problem is even more complex if we consider that state and non-state anti-Semitism were intertwined: non-state anti-Semitism was often caused or encouraged by the state, nevertheless, state authority often prohibited and suppressed anti-Semitic incidents in society and punished the perpetrators.

Goldstein did not consistently adhere to this methodological approach, including in anti-Semitism in Croatia incidents in areas that were not, during the indicated period of history, and are not even today, part of Croatia. Thus, he describes the anti-Semitic statements of the Mostar teacher and writer Ivan Zovko from the beginning of the 20th century and the outburst of the merchant and landowner Marko Perić in Derventa in 1910, he quotes anti-Semitic passages in *Hrvatska sloga*, the bulletin of the political party Hrvatska težačka stranka (Croatian Husbandmen's Party) from Bosnia and Herzegovina, and *Naša sloga*, a Croatian-language newspaper that was published in Trieste from 1870. He mentions how the Croatian "Zvonimir" academic society in Vienna did not admit Jews into its membership, while the society of Croatian academics in Graz behaved "very aggressively" towards Jews (pp. 153-155, 184, 237). In these cases, the criterion of ethnicity of the perpetrators of the anti-Semitic incidents was applied. Their inclusion in the book would be justified if the author wrote about the anti-Semitism of Croats or anti-Semitism among Croats wherever they lived. However, in that case, inclusion in the book of Serbian anti-Semitism in Croatia (pp. 120-124, 193, 299 and other), as well as anti-Semitism of members of the German (p. 339 and other) and Bosniak minority (p. 520 and other), would not be justified. There would be no room for the anti-Semitism of political émigrés in Australia, America, and Western Europe (pp. 434-438).

Such an approach became common in the depictions of anti-Semitism during the Monarchy of Yugoslavia, hence anti-Semitic incidents and outbursts in Serbia (pp. 219, 225, 233-234, 235, 237, 249-250, 259-260, 264, 265, 266, 285-286, 288-289, 317-318, 319, 321, 324-327, 339-344, 357 and other), Slovenia (pp. 257-258, 316, 320, 345, 347, 357, other) and Macedonia (pp. 260, 323-324, other) found their way in the book. The most common depictions are of Muslim, Serbian and Croatian anti-Semitism in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Goldstein notes the expulsion of Jews from Sarajevo around 1920, the boycott of Jewish merchants, anti-Semitic articles in the Serbian radical newspapers *Pravda* from Sarajevo and *Semberija* from Bijeljina, Sarajevo's *Večernje novosti* and the weekly *Narod*, the Muslim paper *Domovina*, the paper of the Yugoslav Muslim organization *Pravda*, the Muslim paper *Slobodna Riječ*, Sarajevo's *Nova riječ*, Sarajevo's Catholic weekly *Katolički tjednik*, Sarajevo's *Pokret* etc. (pp. 221, 232-233, 236-237, 238-239, 239-240, 264-265, 268, 299-300, 312-315, 319, 323, 329-330, 351-352 and other). All of this occupies quite a few pages and has significantly "inflated" the book on anti-Semitism in Croatia.

When the description of anti-Semitism in Bosnia and Herzegovina became methodologically correct within the Independent State of Croatia, Goldstein is mostly silent on this topic. In a modest chapter on anti-Semitism in the Independent State of Croatia, he does not consider the comparatively

strong anti-Semitism of Muslims from Bosnia and Herzegovina. He points to anti-Semitic attitudes within the Catholic Church, from Archbishop Alojzije Stepinac to provincial priests (pp. 405-416), however, he does not mention the views of members of the Islamic religious community, from reis-ul-ulema Fehim Spaho to prominent members of El-Hidaje, such as Mehmed Handžić and Mustafa Busuladžić, to congregational imams. It all amounts to a largely inaccurate reference to the activities of Husein Đozo, one of the most prominent members of the ulema, in the post-war period, rather than in the war period, during which Đozo switched from Croat, Ustasha, and loyal citizen of the Independent State of Croatia to Muslim, a supporter of brotherhood and unity, and loyal citizen of Yugoslavia, collaborator of Sulejman Kemura's "red reis" and a member of the Yugoslav delegations to the assemblies of the Non-Aligned Movement, Arab and Islamic countries.¹ There is no word about anti-Semitism of the "Mladi muslimani" (Young Muslims), active as part of El-Hidaja. Goldstein quotes anti-Semitic passages from various obscure Ustaša publications, however, there is no analysis of *Handžar*, *Osvit*, *Sarajevski novi list*, *Novi behar*, *Hrvat – muslimanski godišnjak*, *Muslimanska/Hrvatska*

¹ Goldstein writes that Đozo was a *Sturmbannführer* (p. 403), whereas he was actually an *SS-Hauptsturmführer*, he does not know in which role he was active in the Handžar Division and it seems to Goldstein that he "did not participate in military operations" (p. 403), although Goldstein must be aware that he was an imam in the 13th Waffen SS Mountain Division, Handschar Division, and occasionally substituted the main division imam, who was in charge of the religious and ideological education of soldiers. He also states that, in 1943, Đozo published in Zagreb a "booklet *Jevrejska pravda*" (Jewish Justice), which could no longer be found (pp. 403-404). It would be extremely strange if, in 1943, a publication was issued in the Independent State of Croatia with the adjective "jevrejski" (Jewish) in the title, while Đozo himself used the other, more common Croatian term "židovski" (Jewish) in his anti-Semitic texts. Did Goldstein read superficially Sekelj's (2020) account that Đozo, as the editor of the post-war publication *Preporod*, published the article "Jevrejska Pravda" written by Lutva Kurić, which is "identical to Đozo's texts from 1943 (...)?" Did he fabricate the 1943 "booklet" by Đozo, the reason why he could not find it? This would not be his first or only lapse in this area of research. Zvonimir Bernwald (2012, 2018), a Slavonian *folksdojčer* (volksdeutsche) and official translator in the Handschar Division, demonstrated that Goldstein did not know who Alija Selimbegović was, the editor of the Croatian section of the propaganda bulletin of the Handschar Division, which was printed in both German and Croatian, so Goldstein suggested that this person might not have existed. "*Alija Selimbegović* came to us from Poglavnik Pavelić's press department in Zagreb. He was a subtle, highly educated, and friendly intellectual, a great friend of Germany. He soon contracted tuberculosis and went to a sanatorium in Valduna in Vorarlberg" (Bernwald, 2012: 59). The Bosnian edition added to this: "I heard he survived the war, but I learned nothing more about him. In any case, it is certainly not an alias (as is speculated by Croatian historian Dr Ivo Goldstein, who researched the *Handschar* journal), but a real person" (Bernwald, 2018: 62). Bernwald is referring to a note about Selimbegović in an article by Goldstein: "I did not find this name on any list of names, nor in the registers of the Ministry of Armed Forces of the Independent State of Croatia (MINORS) kept in the Croatian State Archives in Zagreb. It is possible that this is an alias" (Goldstein, 2006: 272).

svijest and other publications. In passing, he mentions the activities and influence of the Grand Mufti, Mohammed Haj Amin el-Husseini, on the Muslim religious elite and Muslims in general during his visit to the Independent State of Croatia – Zagreb, Banja Luka, and Sarajevo – in 1943. It is not clear why the author does not refer to three of Husseini's political pamphlets published in the Croatian language in 1943, as he refers to translations of the anti-Semitic works of other authors, as well as to Husseini's speeches to soldiers and imams of the Handschar Division (cf. Höpp, 2004). One of these pamphlets, *Islam and Judaism* (Husseini, 1943), stands out as a textbook example of intransigent, essentialist anti-Semitism.² Also not considered is his role in preventing the transfer of Jewish children from the Independent State of Croatia to Palestine (Carpi 1977a, 1977b). From the extensive literature of Israeli, American, German, and other authors on Husseini, which also considers his role in the ideological profiling and organizational structure of the 13th Waffen SS Mountain Division, Handschar Division, Goldstein has been satisfied for years with the reception of the old book by Ženi Lebl (1993), which does not enjoy a high reputation within academic circles due to factual errors and the political bias of the author, and even the older book by Redžić (1987) on Muslim autonomy. It also does not mention translations of the speeches and works of Shakib Arslan and Rashid Ali al-Gaylani, two other prominent anti-Semites and Nazi collaborators, in Muslim publications in the Independent State of Croatia.

When he moved on to describing anti-Semitism in socialist Yugoslavia, there was no longer a border between the anti-Israeli and anti-Semitic policies of the Yugoslav state authorities, the incidents of its officials, the writings of party and state publications, and the emergence of social anti-Semitism in certain Yugoslav republics, on the one hand, and anti-Semitism in the Socialist Republic of Croatia, on the other.³ The “latent” anti-Semitic phase from 1945 to 1967 was described mainly by means of the bizarre incidents of individuals. The “manifest” phase, which begins with a radical reversal of Yugoslav foreign policy following Israel's victory in the Six-Day War in 1967 and the consequent occupation of areas intended for an Arab state by a UN

² “Jews have spread like locusts throughout the Arabian Peninsula. They have come to Mecca, to Medina, to Iraq and Palestine, that is to say, to the land flowing with milk and honey” (Husseini, 1943: 5). Since the Romans had already declared them as a “hearth of contagion”, it is understandable that “Jews in Arabia are, to this day, called microbes” (6). Therefore, Arabs “have a particular understanding for this, that vigorous measures have been taken against Jews in Germany, and that they have been expelled from the country. England and America allowed the Jews after World War II to settle in Palestine and establish a Jewish state there. This is where the Jewish dung from all the countries came together and threw itself at taking away land from the Arabs in a thieving manner” (p. 6).

³ In depictions of anti-Semitism in Yugoslavia from 1945 to 1991, Goldstein largely recounts the texts of the Vojvodina sociologist Laslo Sekelj (1981, 1995: 59-85).

resolution in 1947 (West Bank, Gaza Strip, and East Jerusalem, as well as the Golan Heights in Syria). “In Yugoslavia at the time”, Goldstein writes, “there began to be ‘anti-Zionist’ incidents” (p. 440). They were much more than “incidents” – it was a continuous anti-Israeli and anti-Zionist policy of the Yugoslav state, conducted by Tito. It was reinforced by the Yugoslav membership in the Non-Aligned Movement, in which the attitude towards the “Palestinian issue” was provided by Arab and Islamic states (Egypt, Iraq, Syria, Libya, Lebanon, Sudan, etc.), as well as by the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) as a non-state member of the movement. Political declarations from Non-Aligned summits, which talk about Israeli-Arab conflicts and Israel, are discursively almost identical to the political documents of the PLO from its radical terrorist phase. All sorts of expressions of such foreign policy, defined in Belgrade, are “recorded” in the history of anti-Semitism in Croatia: from the decisions of state and party authorities and the incidents of high-ranking state officials (for example, Ambassador Faik Dizdarević) to military (*Front*, Belgrade), religious (*Preporod*, Sarajevo), student (*Indeks*, Novi Sad) writings and other publications to anti-Jewish demonstrations in Belgrade.⁴

Goldstein did not abandon such an approach even in the chapter on anti-Semitism in independent Croatia, in which he again refers to anti-Semitic incidents in Slovenia, Serbia, Montenegro, and Bosnia and Herzegovina. Moreover, a special section on the “new phase in the history of Serbian anti-Semitism” in Serbia (pp. 512-515) was incorporated into this chapter. Assessing this period, Goldstein notes:

The fact is that classical (or direct) anti-Semitism in Croatia was significantly weaker than in other post-socialist countries, however, such a claim should be put very precisely into context. In fact, just as in the interwar period, Croatian nationalism... had a priority interest in discussing Yugoslavia and confronting Serbian nationalism, and Jews, in Ustasha anti-Semitism and in the nationalist wave after 1990, for many reasons, took a back seat (pp. 468-469).

At the heart of this chapter is the “Tudjman case”, based on the recounting of the content and fate of his book *Bespuća povijesne zbiljnosti* (pp. 470-489). Goldstein concludes that, writing all the “nonsense” in that book, “Franjo Tudjman put himself on the list of revisionists, Holocaust deniers, and thus, logically, of anti-Semites” (p. 483). The second “anti-Semitic pattern” of ac-

⁴ It would have been important if Goldstein had also warned of the influence of Karl Marx’s works on generations of students of the humanities and the social sciences at Yugoslav universities, who had been taught about the Jew as a symbolic greedy capitalist, exploiter of the proletariat. Marx’s piece, a *Critique on the Jewish Question* was declared “one of the classics of anti-Semitic propaganda” by Bernard Lewis (1986: 112).

tivity consisted of historical revisionism, that is, “Ustasha nostalgia”, which manifested itself in the change of the name of the Victims of Fascism Square (Trg žrtava fašizma), the introduction of the currency called kuna, the names of the Office of National Security and the Croatian National Parliament (Hrvatski državni sabor), the naming of barracks and other institutions after Ustasha officials and military commanders, the singing of Ustasha songs, the activities of the Commission for the Identification of War and Post-War Victims, etc. In the section on anti-Semitism after 2000, Goldstein mentions diverse incidents, as well as their perpetrators: Petar Vučić, Hloverka Novak Srzić, Ante Kostelić, Ante Baković, Vice Vukojević, Šemso Tanković, Milan Ivkošić, Branko Šeparović, and others, however, the real “anti-Semitic star” of that section is the writer from Rijeka, Vedrana Rudan, who fell into disfavour with Goldstein with her harsh statements about the Israeli bombings of Gaza (pp. 517-518, 520-522).

What is anti-Semitism and who are anti-Semites?

The main methodological and theoretical problem of this book stems from the fact that the author did not clearly, analytically distinguish and meaningfully determine anti-Semitism as a state policy, political and social movement and political ideology. Until 1918, Goldstein does not consider anti-Semitism as a political ideology and political or social movement in Croatian lands, but rather portrays it as a set of largely indiscriminately chosen statements and incidents, ranging from more serious attacks on Jews to the marginal and bizarre incidents of anonymous individuals.⁵ An example of a more massive anti-Semitic movement and violence, “most severe before 1941”, can be talked about in the autumn of 1918, as part of the end of the First World War,

⁵ “In Zagreb too, there was something that could be called anti-Semitism. In 1509 Mihael Oprašnić asks Dominik Perović: “Why are you spitting on me and coughing on me like I’m Jewish?” A certain citizen Zvoničić says on one occasion in 1534 that “... he will not socialize (...) with either Jews or bandits” and that he is ‘not afraid of the judge’”(p. 52). “In Ilok, a local postman at the end of the year, carried out ‘anti-Semitic agitation’, to which local authorities gave him a ‘severe reprimand’ under the threat of dismissal” (p. 92). “However, a citizen entered a Varaždin coffee shop drunk and shouted, ‘out with the Jews’, to which the police grabbed him and took him to prison” (92). “In Kraljevčani (...) the inn of the Jew Spitzer in Klasnić was robbed (...) the demonstrators drank the wine of the Jew Neumann” (p. 97). “At the time of the election campaign in 1897, the story began that a cat was baptized in the house of a rabbi in Sisak (...)” (131). The landowner from Topolovac, Stjepan Lovreković, believes that the Croatian people are not sufficiently enlightened to know how to “escape the cunning of the Jews” (p. 143). In 1924, Corso Café in Zagreb “a HANAO (Croatian National Youth) member attacked a Jew who allegedly spoke German and scolded a waiter” (p. 236).

the disintegration of Austria-Hungary and the creation of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, the general economic, social and political crisis (p. 200). He recounted attacks on Jews and the destruction of Jewish property “throughout northern Croatia and Slavonia, on a wide stretch from Ilok to Slunj” (p. 201). Even then, violence was directed not only against Jews, but also against members of other minorities, especially Hungarians and Germans. Even then, there were no fatalities that always provide violence with a more tragic dimension (203-204). In fact, “until the establishment of the Independent State of Croatia, there were not even individual incidents of physical violence against Jews, neither in Croatia, nor in the Yugoslav area as a whole” (287-288). During a long period of history, from the Middle Ages until 1941, there was, therefore, no mass, violent anti-Semitic movement in Croatia.

Furthermore, Goldstein does not systematically analyze Croatian political ideologies or, more precisely, anti-Semitic components of these ideologies, but rather comments on sporadic anti-Semitic statements and incidents of their representatives and advocates. The analysis of anti-Semitism in Rightism (Pravaštvo), Catholic socialism, agrarian nationalism, liberalism, social democracy and other political ideologies was replaced by drawing up an “anti-Semitic profile” of Stjepan Radić⁶, Ante Starčević⁷, Josip Juraj Strossmayer⁸,

⁶ From a verbal attack by Stjepan Radić on Josip Frank as a “cunning Jew” who deserves a “condemnation of political death”, Goldstein concludes that this statement “can be understood by anyone who reads this vehement and aggressive article much more broadly than mere ‘political death’” (p. 132). “Intelligent rising demagogue Stjepan Radić”, along with marginal Milan Obradović and “provincial kabadahija” Grga Tuškan, was the epitome of “provincial anti-Semitism” at the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries (p. 157). As he climbed politically, he “less frequently expressed himself unfavourably about Jews, moreover, he even apologized for earlier statements”. His “demagogy” was no longer directed towards the Jews, but towards the monarchical Yugoslav government, and even then “he did not forget – although relatively rarely – to fire a few anti-Semitic invectives, which remained a permanent feature of his career” (p. 168). Goldstein repeatedly returns to this syntagm: Radić even later “was known to freely fire anti-Semitic invectives, albeit less frequently than earlier” (p. 241). “Therefore, anti-Semitic invectives certainly do not significantly determine Radić’s ideology and political practice” (p. 244).

⁷ “Starčević’s views on Jews should be considered anti-Semitism, both by 19th century and today’s standards, although he never resorted to anti-Semitic agitation.” The occasional philo-Semitism “somewhat relativizes the malignancy of his anti-Semitism” (p. 106).

⁸ “Strossmayer accepted anti-Semitic theses such as the connection between Judaism and Freemasonry, as well as the one concerning the control of Jews over the press... Strossmayer would sometimes find himself on the side of reactionary circles in daily political discussions. If one can talk about his anti-Semitism, this anti-Semitism is contradictory, and in any case paradigmatic” (p. 115).

Franjo Supilo⁹, August Šenoa,¹⁰ Ante Kovačić,¹¹ Antun Gustav Matoš,¹² Ksaver Šandor Gjalskog,¹³ Milan Marjanović¹⁴ and other prominent figures of Cro-

⁹ After the editor of the regime's newspaper from Osijek, *Die Drau*, Julius Pfeiffer attacked Supilo's *Riečki novi list*, and declared Supilo a "Dalmatian Greek", to which he "replied extremely inappropriately: he attacked the 'Jew' Pfeiffer and his brother-in-law 'Jew' Josip Frank, and then ascertained that 'here he highlights Judaism because in question is not only Frank and only Pfeiffer', but 'the vast majority of Jews in Croatia follow this Frankist-Hungarian insolence and approve of it. The virtuous Jews, who are opposed to it and who condemn this insolence, are so few, that they can hardly be considered.'" Supilo's ferocity, Goldstein considers, grows into a threat: "Hasn't the time come for the Croatian people to take a decisive stand against these Hungarian and German Jews", which could result in "Jews in Croatia who are overwhelmingly solidary with this rubbish – who could, by chasing the fox, drive out the wolf" (p.189).

¹⁰ Šenoa expressed his anti-Semitism in literary works and texts in *Vienac* and in attacks on Josip Frank (pp. 169-170).

¹¹ Goldstein sees Kovačić's anti-Semitism in the manner in which he described the local Jewish merchant, from whom Ivica Kičmanović buys a suit in his novel *U registraturi*. "There are more anti-Semitic invectives in Kovačić: He calls Jews by derogatory names 'Žid', 'Žudija', 'Izrael', constructs the image of a 'Hebrew' woman who imprisons and deceives peasants" (p. 170). In addition, he called one journalist "a christened soul, but of Israeli origin" (p. 170). To clarify what is anti-Semitic about this, it should be remembered that Kovačić's attitude "reflects the widespread understanding, at that time, of the strong Jewish influence on newspapers, as well as that christening does not abolish the 'Jewish spirit'" (p. 170).

¹² Matoš was also anti-Semitic because in the "Dreyfus affair", to which he referred in his oeuvre "on fifty occasions", he was against Zola (pp. 134-135). He also expressed anti-Semitism in literary works and articles. In a particular article, it says: "(...) Take Ilica street from Jelačić Square to Mesnička street: an embarrassing shame, only foreign companies, and foreign names. There is no Croatian industry at all. Lower Town is so impregnated with foreignness, that Lower Town is no longer Zagreb (...) who has a salon in Zagreb has a salon that is Kraut and Jewish" (p. 171). The poor and half-famished Matoš hated the Jews also due to "a kind of envy" (p. 171).

¹³ Gjalski, in his novel, *Đurčica Agićeva*, "portrays Jews in negative tones" and uses "racist arguments", however, his anti-Semitism remained "indicated but not elaborated" (pp. 171-172). In the 1920s, Gjalski "returned to the old anti-Semitic patterns": "In a café, he saw a woman who had her legs crossed, exposing her thighs. He claimed that the 'short skirt and short hairstyle fashion were created by Parisian Jewish tailors and Jewish traffickers.' He also referred to Josephine Baker's guest appearance in Zagreb, writing that 'the lovely mulatto Josefina Baker was enthusiastically and admirably welcomed by native and newly arrived Jews (...) and this is not only the case in Zagreb, but almost all over the planet, where Jewish views prevail', so he concludes that 'the emergence of this new female fashion is all the more serious because it has a source and an origin. This mighty and powerful Jewishness is both father and godfather to this present-day woman's fashion, which fundamentally changes women'" (p. 245).

¹⁴ "Marjanović's description of the Croatian Jew is a typical image of the 'other' or 'different', as we find it, for example, in Serbian culture as well" (p. 172).

atian political and cultural history.¹⁵ Miroslav Krleža was not spared either, although the author shows understanding for his “anti-Semitic deviations”.¹⁶ An exception is Vladko Maček, who “consistently condemned anti-Semitism and opposed its spreading” (p. 272). However, Maček was a co-signatory of anti-Semitic decrees of the Yugoslav government in October 1940, which restricted the rights of Jews in trade and education. The real creator of these decrees, though, was Minister of Education and President of the Slovenian People’s Party, Anton Korošec, “the biggest anti-Semite in the Yugoslav ruling elite” (258). Maček later defended himself by claiming that the decrees were not an expression of his conviction and that he opposed the government’s attempts to continue restricting the rights of Jews. Government decrees were part of state policy that directly discriminated against Jews and affected the lives of many individuals, consequently, signing them was a worse act than describing a literary hero using anti-Semitic stereotypes or the occasional “anti-Semitic invective” by politicians without power. Goldstein, in turn, relativizes the meaning of these decrees which “did not represent an essential factor in the later genocide” (419).

When one approaches the painting of political profiles of individuals as Goldstein has, almost all of the important figures of Croatian politics and culture transpire as being anti-Semitic, since nearly everyone said something unpleasant about Jews at one time or another. With some exaggeration, one might be tempted to say that missing from this gallery of characters are only the Zrinski and Frankopani, especially since in one place it is suggested that the Hungarian-Croatian King Andrew II, who ruled in the 13th century, was an anti-Semite (p. 396). Worst of all, they all appear, in this interpretation,

¹⁵ Goldstein treats the works of Croatian writers much like contemporary Bosniak nationalists treat the literary works of Ivo Andrić, Petar Petrović Njegoš, and Ivan Mažuranić. Three literary classics of Serbian, Montenegrin and Croatian literature, *Na Drini ćuprija*, *Gorski vijenac* and *Smrt Smail-age Čengića*, were proclaimed as textbook examples of “genocidal literature”, which prepared the war in Bosnia and Herzegovina in the 1990s and the genocide against Bosniaks. The “genocidal ideas” of their authors simply “emerged” out of the book covers and turned into a murderous political force. Goldstein constructs a Croatian “anti-Semitic literature”, into which the authors’ personal anti-Semitism is woven, preparing the genocide of Jews in the Independent State of Croatia. In question is an ideologically motivated and scientifically illegitimate procedure (Bulatović, 2017; Milutinović, 2018).

¹⁶ “Krleža was in certain ways a philo-Semite, however, he had some harsh remarks about Jews (as well as about Croats, and yet he was a great patriot)” (p. 173). In *Pijana novembarska noć*, he calls Josip Frank “Jozua” (Joshua), but “it is worth understanding the context” in which he did this: Frank is mentioned as the father-in-law of Slavko Kvaternik, whom Krleža attacks for serving Austria-Hungary, followed by Yugoslav interests. Therefore, “Krleža uncompromisingly settles accounts with the elite, and consequently also with Frank as part of that elite” (p. 173). Everyone before Krleža had dealt with Frank exclusively as a Jew, that is, a christened Jew.

as precursors to the Holocaust. Many great European thinkers and artists – from St. Augustine to Luther, from Kant to Voltaire, from Balzac to T. S. Eliot – are linked by some form of anti-Semitism, however, it is difficult to claim that they prepared the Holocaust. Although this seems blasphemous today, anti-Semitic incidents of individuals were common in pre-Holocaust history when there was a broad consensus on “tolerance of intolerance” towards members of various racial, religious and ethnic communities, and not only towards Jews. Anti-Semitism was not attributed the sinister significance it acquired with the rise of Nazism and the Holocaust.

Feldman (2018) thinks that the history of the term anti-Semitism is marked by the dispute between the *eternalists vs. contextualists*. “Eternalists” search in history for a constant and invariable “eternal hatred of the Jew”. Goldstein is close to this current of thought by establishing the historical continuity of anti-Semitism by compiling an “assortment” of anti-Semitic ideas, writings, and statements that prepared the Holocaust:

Thus, an atmosphere was created in which what was desired by the various promoters of anti-Semitism – a world without Jews – became possible. The Holocaust, which took place between 1933 and 1945 and claimed six million (or somewhat fewer) Jewish lives was the result of centuries of systematic anti-Semitic hysteria, in which the deportation and mass killing of Jews for a good part of the public in many European countries became the logical consequence of their alleged negative role throughout history. This was the situation not only in the Reich, but also in all the countries under Nazi control (p. 42).

If this approach is applied to Croatia, it reads as follows:

A humorous and skilfully worded poem about the insatiable desire of Jews for profit at all costs could perhaps in some situations be considered only an unsavoury or inappropriate invective, had not, at the same time, various anti-Semitic patterns emanating hatred not been promoted in the public, and had not this hatred translated into violence in 1883 and 1918, which would peak during the Independent State of Croatia (p. 99).

Or like this:

Naša gruda promotes aggressive anti-Semitism, and *Senzacija* unscrupulous sensationalism. In the printed matter that appears in the coming years, these two elements will be joined. The final result was the Holocaust (277-278).¹⁷

¹⁷ *Naša gruda* and *Senzacija* had low circulation and were uninfluential papers. “The anti-Semitic press in terms of influence and importance could in no way be compared to the

The Holocaust in the Independent State of Croatia is thus presented as a legitimate offspring of the process of cultivation of centuries of verbal violence, and not a primarily contingent event that enabled the world and civil war from 1941 to 1945, the breakdown of the old and the violent transition into the new state, the vassal status of that state, the totalitarian political order, the radicalization of Ustasha ideology and politics, etc. In order for the “eternalistic” or, more conventionally put, historical-deterministic approach to be convincing, Goldstein would have to prove that the Holocaust took place in all European countries with anti-Semitic traditions. This was not the case, although some countries had a very strong tradition of anti-Semitism. If centuries of cumulation of anti-Semitic violence were to legally lead to genocide, then it would be inevitable primarily in Russia, i.e., the Soviet Union. However, this did not occur. Until the war, anti-Semitism in Croatia was relatively weak, weaker than in most Eastern and Central European countries, both because of the small number of Jews and because of the complex relations in the two monarchies, Austria-Hungary and Yugoslavia, in which Croats had more powerful and important opponents – Germans, Hungarians, Italians, Serbs – than Jews. Nevertheless, the Holocaust took place.

However, Goldstein does not consistently adhere to the “eternalistic” approach, so in certain places he offers contextual explanations:

As everywhere in Europe, the example and incentive to persecute and kill Jews in the Independent State of Croatia was the policy of the Third Reich, which had a decisive impact on the Independent State of Croatia and on which the Independent State of Croatia depended. The Germans brought to power a group that they knew would be very similar to them in ideology and practice (for instance, if Maček and the Croatian Peasant Party (HSS) had come to power, as some had wished and planned, the persecution of Jews would either not take place, or the Nazis would have had to forcibly organize them themselves) (p. 418).

An undefined and contradictory approach to the research is an expression of the scarce use of the most relevant academic literature on anti-Semitism. Bartrop and Jacobs (2011) compiled a book on fifty key thinkers on genocide and the Holocaust – and anti-Semitism is the ideological basis of the Holocaust – in the 20th and early 21st centuries. Of these fifty authors, on Goldstein’s list of references, there are only three – Hannah Arendt, Yehuda Bauer, and Zygmunt Bauman, with one work respectively.

newspapers and magazines that defended the Jews. The most influential Croatian newspapers – *Jutarnji list*, very often *Novosti* and *Hrvatski dnevnik* – made a clear decision and fiercely opposed the extreme press.” (p. 297)

The superficial and anachronistic remarks about anti-Semitism in countries that included some Croatian lands at certain historical periods catches the eye. Goldstein belongs to an old historiographical current that considered anti-Semitism in Fascist Italy quite benevolently: “In 1938, the Italian authorities passed a ‘decree defending the Italian race’, which, among other things, prohibited mixed marriages. However, in Italy, there was never drastic persecution of Jews, until the autumn of 1943, when they were carried out by the German occupation authorities” (p. 41). He prefers the conventional narrative according to which the anti-Semitism of Italian Fascism was substantively different from the anti-Semitism of German Nazism. This vulgate is rooted in the collective memory of Italians and is part of the “standard historical repertoire in contemporary Italian politics” (Schlemmer and Woller, 2005: 166; see also Luconi, 2004; Rodogno, 2005, 2006; Sarfati, 2006; Pava, 2006). Italian anti-Semitic legislation was not a mere copy of German law and was not enacted solely under German pressure: “Grotesque racist legislation was an Italian product and consisted of a mixture of biological and scientific ideas derived from various racist schools of thought in the Italian scientific community and the political and ideological needs of the regime” (Rodogno, 2005: 215).

The debate on Italian anti-Semitism must not be confined to Italy but must also take into account what the Italian imperial government did in its colonies and the countries it occupied, as in the case of Germany – finally, Auschwitz, Treblinka, and Majdanek were built on the soil of Poland. And the government had committed terrible crimes. In its colony in Libya and North Africa, it did not persecute and abuse only Arabs and Berbers, but also Jews, organizing their mass deportation to concentration camps, where many died (Bernhard, 2018). Nor must the attitude of Italy towards Palestine be forgotten, in which they militarily, politically, and financially supported the Great Arab Rebellion (1936-1939), directed against the Jewish community in Palestine, and the British Mandate Administration as its protector. At the beginning of the 1930s, the Consulate General of Italy in Jerusalem had a political connection with the leader of the Palestinian Arabs, the Mufti of Jerusalem Husseini, and began financing their anti-Jewish projects (Arielli, 2008, 2010b). When he fled from the Middle East to Europe, Husseini first settled in Rome, where he was welcomed by the Italian political elite, including Mussolini. Husseini sought Mussolini’s support for the abolition of the “national home of the Jewish people” in Palestine, demanding that “Jews in Arab lands be treated equally as in the Axis countries” (Carpi, 1983: 106). The *Duce* agreed with the Mufti claiming that Jews have no racial, historical, or other right to establish a “Zionist state” in Palestine. “If Jews want it,” he added, “they should establish Tel Aviv in America.” He called himself a “veteran of anti-Semitism”, and the Jews “our enemies” for whom “there is no place in Europe: not even in Italy, where there are, at most, 45,000 of them among the 45 million inhabitants.

They are few in number, but there are no more than 2,500 who deserve to stay” (as cited in: Carpi, 1983: 107).

Did Mussolini run out of time to move from the social and spiritual to the physical destruction of the Jews? Shortly before the fall of his Fascist empire in 1943, mass deportations of Jews from Florence, Milan, and Venice to Auschwitz took place. The most enthusiastic advocates and executors of the plan to bomb the cities of Palestine were also the Italians, something Husseini constantly persuaded them of. In addition to joint actions with the Germans and the French, from July to October 1941, they independently carried out twelve air strikes on Haifa and one on Tel Aviv. The deadliest was the attack on Tel Aviv in September 1941, in which 117 Jewish and seven Arab civilians were killed, as well as an Australian soldier, and some parts of the city were destroyed. Radio Bari accompanied this with a propaganda campaign in Arabic, in which he called on the “brave Arabs” to join the Italians, to enable them to liberate Palestine from the Jews (Arrieli, 2010a). It is, therefore, difficult to imagine how the perniciousness of Italian anti-Semitism can be diminished and relativized. In general, casual and superficial remarks about topics that are not the author’s main subject are an unfortunate method of academic communication.

To this should be added the approach to anti-Semitism and the Ottoman Empire. Turkish historical revisionists insist that the Ottoman Empire, from beginning to end, was a tolerant multi-religious and multi-ethnic community, denying the most horrific events that marked the history of the empire in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, such as the “Bulgarian Horrors” of 1876, the “Hamidian Massacres”, as well as the genocide of the Armenians, the persecution and massacres of Greeks, Assyrians and members of other Christian minorities, but also Jews. Goldstein writes that, after the expulsions from Spain and Portugal, the Ottoman Empire “welcomed the Jews with open arms because, thanks to them, trade was developing strongly” (p. 25). What happened to Jews after they were received “with open arms” in the Ottoman Empire and, later, in Kemalist Turkey can be learned from the critical literature (Baer, 2004, 2008, 2010, 2013; Bayraktar, 2006; Dinçşahin and Goodwin, 2011; Bali, 2012a, 2012b; Pekesen, 2012; Eligür, 2017; Nicosia and Ergene, 2018).

As the author gave up on basing his understanding of anti-Semitism and its history on the reception of the most relevant academic literature, he turned to dictionaries, lexicons, encyclopedias, and political documents: “Kraus’s pregnant and sarcastic answer” to the question of what anti-Semitism is,¹⁸ to Webster’s Dictionary, Hrvatski jezični portal (Croatian Language Portal), and the “working definition” of the International Holocaust Remembrance

¹⁸ Austrian poet and publicist Karl Kraus defined anti-Semitism as “a serious disease of the majority people or religion that is fatal to the Jews” (p. 9).

Alliance. From this book, but also Goldstein's previous scientific and professional papers, newspaper texts, and public statements, it is obvious that he has accepted the previously stated "working definition" of anti-Semitism. As in this "working definition", Goldstein's understanding of anti-Semitism is quite inclusive and essentially equates anti-Semitism, anti-Zionism, and anti-Israelism, although these are not historically, substantively, and semantically equal terms (cf. Herf, 2013).

Commenting on a 1975 UN resolution declaring Zionism "a form of racism and racial discrimination", Goldstein argues that it established a new pattern for the spread of anti-Semitism, "in the sense that 'we have nothing against Jews, but we do against Israeli politics'. Such an attitude can also be placed under the term 'anti-Zionism', which today is considered one of the forms of anti-Semitism" (p. 46), as well as almost any criticism of Israeli politics. Furthermore, Goldstein also writes the following:

Furthermore, it is significant to note that, also considered anti-Semitism, is the imposition of 'double standards on Israel'. It is not anti-Semitism when criticizing Israeli politics, but it is anti-Semitism when it is claimed that 'the existence of the state of Israel is racist in character', when today's Israeli politics are compared with Nazi politics, when Israel is required to behave as no other democratic state.

For example, unacceptable is the claim that could be heard during the conflicts between Israel and Gaza in recent years that Gaza is actually a camp. The contexts are completely different. Did inmates from Jasenovac or Auschwitz shell nearby settlements? From 2001 to 2014, 18,928 shells and bombs were fired at Israel from Gaza; 33 people, mostly civilians, were killed and 1971 were wounded. In the border areas of Israel, a high percentage of the population has PTSD symptoms, which is reflected, among other things, in the increased percentage of miscarriages (18-19).

The incorporation of this political pamphlet into an intentional academic piece is inappropriate. However, now that Goldstein has already done so, it deserves to be analysed. Goldstein often expressed similar views on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, especially on the "Gaza-Israel" conflict. Conflict between Gaza and Israel? This sounds like a conflict between two states. However, in question is an extremely asymmetrical conflict between an economically highly developed and well-armed state with a very poor, poorly armed, and politically undefined entity spanning 365 km² and home to more than two million people, mostly refugees and displaced persons from Israel and the West Bank and their descendants, making it one of the most crowded places in the world. Formally withdrawing its army from that narrow coastal strip where very few Jewish settlers lived in 2005, Israel told the Palestinians that they could create

“their Singapore” there. The potential “Palestinian Singapore” is a completely closed area from land, sea, and air, as Israel controls all land border crossings and blocks air and sea traffic. “Gaza has become the quintessential representative of a new culture – what we call a camp society” (Kimmerling and Migdal, 2003: 228). Goldstein knowingly manipulates the mention of Auschwitz and Jasenovac. No one has claimed that Gaza is a death camp, but an “open-air camp” or a “camp society”, which are sociologically legitimate terms.

In repeated reprisals for the armed provocations and attacks of Hamas and Islamic Jihad from Gaza on its border areas, Israel killed and wounded tens of thousands of Palestinians and destroyed thousands of homes and other buildings. At least 1380 people were killed in the 2008-2009 attack, including 431 children and 112 women, and 5380 people were wounded, including 1872 children and 800 women. Two hundred fourteen schools, 34 hospitals, and clinics, 46,000 private apartments, 80 percent of the crop and agricultural infrastructure was destroyed or damaged, etc. An attack in 2014 killed 200 and injured about 11,000 people. Destroyed or damaged were two hundred seventy-seven state and UN schools, 6 universities, 17 hospitals, and clinics, etc. There were devastating air strikes in the following years. For example, the May 2021 attack killed 200 Palestinians.

Indeed, double standards apply to Israel to a large extent, but in its favour, and not to the detriment of Israel. There is tolerance for Israel for non-compliance with UN resolutions, international law and for ignoring international courts. The occupation of the territories that were granted to the Arab state by the UN resolution, on which Israel was established, and which has lasted 55 years, is tolerated. Discrimination against Palestinians in the occupied territories is tolerated. Illegal construction and constant expansion of Jewish settlements in the West Bank are tolerated, although international law prohibits the settlement of one’s own population in occupied territories. The annexation of East Jerusalem into the “eternal, unique and indivisible capital of Israel” is tolerated. No one dares to insist on the return of Palestinian Arabs, as victims of ethnic cleansing in the 1948-1949 war, to areas where they lived before the war; around 750,000 Palestinians were expelled or made to flee. By comparison, this is about as many residents as the Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia had at the time. As Macedonia today has about two million inhabitants, and, in addition, a much lower natural increase rate, it is easy to imagine the scale of this ethnic cleansing. Also very one-sided, and often inaccurate, are Goldstein’s “casual” remarks about the Arab-Israeli wars, which would hardly withstand scientific reviews.¹⁹

¹⁹ In question are descriptions of the Suez War in 1956, the Six-Day War in 1967, and the Israeli invasion of Lebanon in 1982 (pp. 438-439, 455-456). There are also factual errors in

There is also something to be said about the language in which the book was written. When, justifiably, he writes about the primitiveness of Croatian anti-Semites, Goldstein illustrates this by their illiteracy (p. 279 et seq.). However, he did not demonstrate an enviable level of literacy himself. The most irritating element is constantly writing the first letter in the first words in what we used to call in primary school quoted or direct speech in lowercase, instead of using the uppercase (pp. 102, 153, 171, 178, 186, 235, 256, 270, 292, 295, 296, 304, 308, 321, 324, 336, 344, 351, 353, 354, 361, 368, 370, 373, 392, 416, 429, 432, 434, 446, 447, et seq.). The author does not know or does not respect the Croatian orthography rules on writing nouns in combined form or separately (*sastavljeno i nesastavljeno pisanje*), so he systematically writes “ne-Židovi” (pp. 31, 50, 61, 87, 211, 217, 350, et seq.), probably according to the English *non-Jews*, instead of “nežidovi” (*nehrvati, neslovinci* etc.). He also uses strange language expressions such as “monstr-procesi” and “monstre-proces” (monster-processes) (pp. 43, 431), “upward mobility proces” (upward mobility process) (p. 59), and incorrectly writes adjectives such as “litvanski svećenik” (Lithuanian priest) (31), etc. The proof-reader credited by publisher *Fraktura* should have taken care of correcting these and other elementary orthographic mistakes. However, *Fraktura* is not what it used to be either.

Conclusion

Goldstein ends his book like this:

This book presents hundreds of data items showing that anti-Semitism is and has been a permanent disease of Croatian society for almost a century and a half. Admittedly, it has always been (except at the time of the Independent State of Croatia) a peripheral phenomenon, which in essential elements does not determine political and social life.

I am certain that there will be angry reactions from the public to this book because its subject is not typical and, even more so, not popular. People who think differently and who will know how to appreciate it will not feel comfortable reading the entire text either. An insight into the history of Croatian anti-Semitism reveals layers of political culture, psychology, and

these “hasty” reviews. Thus, it is written that the task of the post-war UN committee, which included Yugoslavia, was to draft a “proposal for the resolution of the Israeli question” (p. 431), although it was actually a resolution to the “Palestinian question”, which included not only the status of Jews, but of Arabs as well. He claims that the massacre of Palestinians in Sabra and Shatila occurred “at the end of the civil war in Lebanon (1975-1982)” (p. 457), although the civil war did not end until the peace agreement in Taif in 1990.

much more. This is an insight into Croatian society in the past and present (p. 534).

Researchers do not divide books into those that are pleasant and those that are unpleasant to read. They divide them into those that are scientifically relevant because they are theoretically and methodically well grounded, because they reveal new phenomena and offer new approaches and understandings of the researched phenomena, because they bring new knowledge and insights into the investigated phenomena, because they are written in understandable and interesting language and in a good style, on the one hand, and those that are not scientifically relevant because they have nothing or few of these elements, on the other hand. In short, only poorly written books are unpleasant to read. The book *Antisemitizam u Hrvatskoj od srednjega vijeka do danas* (*Anti-Semitism in Croatia from the Middle Ages to the Present*) is not validly founded both theoretically and methodologically, it does not reveal a new phenomenon and does not offer a new approach to its understanding, it does not bring new knowledge and insights on the topic, it is not linguistically and stylistically written in an enviable manner. The basic concepts are undefined and elastic, and the methodology is reduced to selective, inexplicable, and unsystematic stringing and political commenting, most of all, quotes from the press in areas outside of historical and contemporary Croatia.²⁰

Moreover, there were times when I felt quite uneasy reading this book. I felt this way when the author introduces into the book members of his own family, most notably his father, Slavko Goldstein, and when he himself appears in it. Slavko Goldstein appears in the book on more than twenty pages in different roles: as a child of a Jewish family in Karlovac, to whom a Croatian peasant woman had been hesitant to send her son as an apprentice because she heard that Jews slaughter Christian children and drink their blood (p. 259); as a “journalist and film worker” whom the police began monitoring calls in 1967 because he was a “Jew who has a wide circle of acquaintances both in the country and abroad” (pp. 441-442); as President of the Jewish Community, who responds to the anti-Israeli text by *Vjesnik's* Hidajet Bišćević (pp. 460-461); as a person explaining to the public what are *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion* after parts of that pamphlet were published in Ljubljana's

²⁰ In that chapter, there are repetitions of the same statements. Commenting on Franjo Letic's involvement in the translation of the *Protocols of the Elders of Zion*, Goldstein wrote: “In principle, every culture should have a translation of this pamphlet, so it was time for Croatia to have one as well. But only on the condition that an adequate commentary is published along with it” (p. 506). Commenting on the engagement of the same person in the translation of *Mein Kampf*, he wrote: “In principle (...) every culture should have a translation of this Hitler's pamphlet, including Croatia, but on the condition that an adequate commentary is published along with it” (p. 509).

Tribuna (p. 466); as someone who first in *Vjesnik* published “part of the here presented argumentation against Tuđman’s assertions in his book *Bespuća*” and debated with him (pp. 481-482); as a figure whom Tuđman did not want to appoint honorary Canadian consul in Zagreb because he is not “one of our men” and because of whom he looked with doubt at the founding of the Croatian Social Liberal Party (HSLP), which attracted “all of the Jewishness of the City of Zagreb, enough Serbs and Croats who find it difficult to support the HDZ due to the persecution”, although in the crowded hall in the Workers’ Centre “he could spot only three Jews: Daniel Ivin, Slavko Goldstein and me – Ivo Goldstein” (p. 484); as a person with security service protection, because for several weeks in the autumn of 1991, “on the ground floor of the building where Slavko Goldstein lived (he lived on the second of three floors), a policeman guarded 24 hours a day” (499); as an object of attacks by Ustasha émigré Ivo Omrčanin, who stated that “America finances Goldstein” (p. 501), Mladen Schwarz, the embodiment of “Jewish self-hatred”, who said that the French philosopher Alain Finkielkraut “successfully completed the Serbian-UDBA school, and along the way, he apparently passed the fast-track summer ‘cursus completus’ of the Croat-devourer in the lyceum of master Slavko Goldstein” (p. 504), and a “certain” Šime Marković, who wrote a reader’s letter in the low circulation paper *Hrvatski obzor*, evoking memories of the Vukovar tragedy in 1991 and describing the celebration of liberation in the occupied city in 1996, and asked: “Where are the voices and shouts of these Wiesenthals and Goldsteins now?” (p. 505); as the subject of an obscure publisher’s accusation that he primarily “cared about soiling the Croatian state” because he criticized the publication of *The Protocol of the Elders of Zion*, Tuđman’s *Bespuća*, the idea of the conversion of Jasenovac, etc. (p. 508); finally, after death, he was exposed on the Internet to an “eruption of hatred” (pp. 528-529), and some anonymous user on the Internet asked: “How did Slavko Goldstein become a politician in Yugoslavia even though he allegedly has no qualifications for this?” (p. 532). I will refrain from citing passages in which Ivo Goldstein writes about himself (pp. 484, 511, 516-517, 531-532). Let readers assess the severity of these examples and the justification for their inclusion in the book on anti-Semitism in Croatia from the Middle Ages to the present day.

I am of the opinion that personal and family reminiscences belong in family biographies and autobiographies. However, there are, surely, those who think otherwise. Among them are obviously the three reviewers of this book: Aleksandar Jakir, Hrvoje Klasić, and Kotel Dadon.

References

Arielli, N. "Italian Involvement in the Arab Protests in Palestine, 1936-1939". *British Journal of Middle East Studies* 35(2008), 2: 187-204.

Arielli, N. "'Haifa Is Still Burning': Italian, German and French Air Raids on Palestine during the Second World War". *Middle Eastern Studies* 46 (2010a), 3: 331-344. **(Arrieli, 2010a)**

Arielli, N. *Fascist Italy and the Middle East*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Mac-Millan, 2010. **(Arrieli, 2010b)**

Baer, M. D. "The Great Fire of 1660 and the Islamization of Christian and Jewish Space in Istanbul". *International Journal of Middle East Studies*. 36 (2004), 2: 159-181.

Baer, M. D. *Honored by the Glory of Islam. Conversions and Conquest in Ottoman Empire*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Baer, M. D. *The Dönme: Jewish Converts, Muslim Revolutionaries, and Secular Turks*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2010.

Baer, M. D. "An Enemy Old and New: The Dönme, Anti-Semitism, and Conspiracy Theories in the Ottoman Empire and Turkish Republic". *Jewish Quarterly Review* 103 (2013), 4: 523-555.

Bali, R. N. "The Attempted Pogrom against the Jews of Thrace, June-July 1934". In: Astourian, S. H., Kévorkian, R. H. (ed.). *Collective and State Violence in Turkey*. New York: Berghahn, 2021. **(Bali, 2021a)**

Bali, R. N. "Antisemitism in Turkey: A New Phenomenon or More of the Same". In: Lange, A. et al., ed., *Confronting Anti-Semitism in Modern Media, the Legal and Political Worlds*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2021. **(Bali, 2021b)**

Bartrop, P. R., Jacobs, S. L. *Fifty Key Thinkers on the Holocaust and Genocide*. New York: Routledge, 2011.

Bayraktar, H. "The anti-Jewish pogrom in Eastern Thrace in 1934: new evidence for the responsibility of the Turkish government". *Patterns and Prejudice* 40 (2006), 2: 95-111.

Bernhard, P. (2018). "Im Rücken Rommels: Kriegsverbrechen, koloniale Massengewalt und Judenverfolgung in Nordafrika". *Zeitschrift für Genozidforschung* 17 (2018), 1-2: 83-121.

Bernwald, Z. *Muslims in der Waffen-SS: Erinnerungen an die bosnische Division Handžar (1943-1945)*. Graz: Ares, 2012.

Bernwald, Z. *Povijest divizije Handžar: Sjećanja i zapisi prevodioca u divizijskom štabu*. Gračanica: Monos, 2018.

Bulatović, B. "Ideološki tipovi interpretacije i aktualizacije Andrićevog književnog opusa u postjugoslavenskom kontekstu". *Kultura* (2017), 156: 11-47.

Carpi, D. "The Diplomatic Negotiations over the Transfer of Jewish Children from Croatia to Turkey and Palestine in 1943". *Yad Vashem Studies* 12 (1977): 109-124. (Carpi, 1977a)

Carpi, D. "The Rescue of Jews in the Italian Zone of Occupied Croatia". In: Gutman, Y., Zuroff, E., eds.), *Rescue Attempts During Holocaust*. Jerusalem: Yad Vashem, 1977. (Carpi, 1977b)

Carpi, D. "The Mufti of Jerusalem, Amin el-Husseini, and his diplomatic activity during World War I (October 1941 – July 1943)". *Studies in Zionism* 4 (1983), 1: 101-131.

Deringil, S. (2000). "‘There Is No Compulsion in Religion’: On Conversion and Apostasy in the Late Ottoman Empire". *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 42 (2000), 3: 547-575.

Dinçşahin, Ş., Goodwin, S. R. "Toward an encompassing perspective on nationalism: the case of Jews in Turkey during the Second World War, 1939-45". *Nations and Nationalism* 17 (2011), 4: 843-862.

Eligür, B. "The 1934 anti-Jewish Thrace riots: the Jewish exodus of Thrace through the lens of nationalism and collective violence". *British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies*. 44 (2017), 1: 88-109.

Feldman, D. "Toward a History of the Term ‘Anti-Semitism’". *American Historical Review*. 123 (2018), 4: 1139-1150.

Filiu, J. P. *Gaza: A History*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.

Goldstein, I. (2006). "Ustaška ideologija o Hrvatima muslimanske vjere i odgovor časopisa *Handžar*". *Radovi Zavoda za hrvatsku povijest* 38(2006), 1: 259-277.

Herf, J., ed. *Anti-Semitism and Anti-Zionism in historical perspective: Convergence and divergence*. New York: Routledge, 2013.

Höpp, G., ed. *Mufti-Papiere: Briefe, Memoranden, Reden und Aufrufe Amin el-Hussaini aus dem Exil 1940-1945*. Berlin: Klaus Schwarz Verlag, 2004.

Huseini, E. el. *Islam i židovstvo*. Zagreb: Hrvatski tiskarski zavod, 1943.

Kimmerling, B., Migdal, J. *The Palestinian People: A History*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2003.

Lebl, Ž. *Hadž-Amin i Berlin*. Belgrade: Čigoja štampa, 2003 (1993¹).

Lewis, B. *Semites and Anti-Semites*. New York and London: W.W. Norton & Co, 1986.

Luconi, S. "Recent trends in the study of Italian antisemitism under the Fascist Regime". *Patterns and Prejudice* 38 (2004), 1: 1-17.

Milutinović, I. *Bitka za prošlost: Ivo Andrić i bošnjački nacionalizam*. Belgrade: Geopoetika, 2018.

Nicosia, F. R., Ergene, B. A., ed. *Nazism, the Holocaust, and the Middle East: Arab and Turkish Responses*. New York and Oxford: Berghahn, 2018.

Pava, I. *Persecution, Indifference, and Amnesia. The Restoration of Jewish Rights in Postwar Italy*. Jerusalem: Yad Vashem, 2006.

Redžić, E. *Muslimansko autonomaštvo i 13. SS divizija. Autonomija Bosne i Hercegovine i Hitlerov Treći Rajh*. Sarajevo: Svjetlost, 1987.

Pekesen, B. *Nationalismus, Türkisierung und das Ende der jüdischen Gemeinden in Thrakien, 1918-1942*. Munich: Oldenburg Wissenschaftsverlag, 2012.

Rodogno, D. "Italiani brava gente?: Fascist Italy's Policy Toward the Jews in the Balkans, April 1941 – July 1943." *European History Quarterly* 35 (2005), 2: 213-240.

Rodogno, D. *Fascism's European Empire: Italian Occupation during the Second World War*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Sarfati, M. *The Jews in Mussolini's Italy: From Equality to Persecutions*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2006.

Sekelj, L. (1981). "Antisemitizam u Jugoslaviji (1918-1945)". *Revija za sociologiju* 11 (1981), 3-4: 179-189.

Sekelj, L. *Vreme beščašća: Oglеди o nacionalizmu*. Belgrade: Institut za evropske studije, 1995.

Sekelj, L. *Antisemitizam u SFRJ*. www.antipolitika.noblogs.org/post/2020/07/30/antisemitizam-u-sfrj

Tilley, V. (ed.). *Beyond Occupation. Apartheid, Colonialism and International Law in the Occupied Palestinian Territories*. London: Pluto, 2012.