

A homage to agitprop: Ivo Goldstein, *Povijesni revizionizam i neoustaštvo – Hrvatska 1989. – 2022* [Historical Revisionism, and Neo-Ustashism – Croatia 1989-2022] (Zagreb: Fraktura, 2023) or How to expose historian Goldstein's ignorance and deceptions – A few examples to begin with ...

Vladimir GEIGER*

In recent years, Professor Ivo Goldstein has written numerous books on the history of 20th century Croatia. After all, he is a significant figure in the public life of our homeland, the son of Slavko Goldstein, a university professor, historian, linguist, intellectual, academic, diplomat, and inventor (of “the bone-crushing machine”). Sadly, I could not align myself with the progressive forces that have always valued and celebrated the diligent work of polymath Ivo Goldstein. As he published new and extensive books, I couldn't help but notice both new and old mistakes, absurdities, and unfounded claims within them ... I have often written about this, including on the pages of this journal.

Since Ivo Goldstein is diligent and persistent, he has written yet another extensive book – this time about historical revisionism and neo-Ustashism in Croatia – so I feel the need to offer my comments on it, especially those parts that concern me personally.

At the outset, it is worth mentioning that an “introduction” of sorts to this book was published in 2022 in a journal in the form of a scientific article. The article was authored by Goldstein and a historian of his type of knowledge, Goran Hutinec, PhD, from the Department of History at the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences in Zagreb. While explaining the fate of Jewish women and their children from the Đakovo Internment Camp in the summer of 1942, Goldstein and Hutinec state the following in that article:

“The Ustasha carried out the operation of the transfer of the female detainees and their children from Đakovo to Jasenovac in utmost secrecy. On 8 June [1942], the care of the detainees and their children was handed over to the Ustasha Defence Forces. On 12 June [1942], the Jewish Community of Osijek reported that ‘540 women, younger and healthier, have been transported from Đakovo in an unknown direction (...) the women were not taken to Čitluk (in Herzegovina, in the Italian zone, thus to safety! – author's comment), as we had hoped, but apparently towards Jasenovac. [...]”¹

* Vladimir Geiger, PhD, Croatian Institute of History, Zagreb, Croatia; geiger@isp.hr

¹ Ivo Goldstein, Goran Hutinec, “Kako raskrinkati tvrdnje povijesnih revizionista – pet primjera,” in *Zbornik Janković* (2021), nos. 5-6: 179.

Unfortunately, there was no safety for the Jewish women and children, and there is no safety for the facts either. Therefore, the hopes, Goldstein and Hutinec conclude, that the Ustasha might have taken the women and children from the Đakovo Internment Camp to Čitluk in Herzegovina, to “the Italian zone” of the Independent State of Croatia or the NDH, and “thus to safety,” were not fulfilled. What a truly *brilliant* conclusion by the Goldstein-Hutinec duo. And a prime example of their in-depth knowledge of the Holocaust in the NDH.

As far as can be discerned, the duo did not ask themselves why the Ustasha would even consider sending the women and children from Đakovo to “Herzegovina”. That is completely absurd! But not for Goldstein and Hutinec. Since they are competent and scrupulous historians, great experts, it would indeed be too much to expect them to add two and two together, and not get three or five, but four.

The Čitluk referred to by Osijek’s Jewish Community in the said report is, in reality, the estate of the Serbian Orthodox Orahovica Monastery near the village of Feričanci (Našice). There exist documents about this at the Croatian State Archives in Zagreb, for example, in the Ustasha Surveillance Service (UNS) collection, and the State Commission on Occupier and Collaborator Crimes (ZKRZ) collection.² For instance, in sources from the ZKRZ archive collection, one can find the following:

“The Feričanci Camp Farm was established in May 1942 in parallel with the establishment of the camp farm in the village of Okučani. Detainees from the Jasenovac Camp, and later also those who were transferred here directly – approximately 250 people in total – worked in agriculture on the Čitluk heath near the village of Feričanci.”³

In other words, sources are available, and someone who is truly competent would not write absurdities about the alleged sending of Jews from the Đakovo camp to Herzegovina, “to safety.” But Goldstein (and Hutinec) are obviously not competent. They don’t know, they pontificate, and they draw conclusions that belong in what could be called the anthology of contemporary Croatian historiographical absurdities.

The text of Goldstein’s aforementioned article, which was co-authored by Hutinec, became a significant portion of the contents of Goldstein’s latest book. This can easily be verified by comparing the content of the article

² Cf. HR-HDA-248. Ustaška nadzorna služba (UNS), Command, Office IV, camps, 3/248, and HR-HDA-306. Zemaljska komisija za utvrđivanje zločina okupatora i njihovih pomagača (ZKRZ), Guz, 2235/24-45, Okrug Osijek, XII Ekonomat Feričanci, 91 (124).

³ HR-HDA-306. ZKRZ, Guz, 2235/24-45, Okrug Osijek, XII Ekonomat Feričanci, 91 (124).

with the content of the book. The fact that the article was actually written as part of a book is confirmed by a citation in the article that escaped the attention of both Goldstein and Hutinec, as well as the reviewer or reviewers, the proof-reader, and even the editor of the prestigious journal in which the article was published. The citation reads: “In this book, we have already mentioned on several occasions [...]”⁴ I assume it should have read: “In this article [...]”! But when one, or more than just one person, is scrupulous – they are scrupulous.

This raises an ethical million-dollar question for the science of history: where did Hutinec disappear to in the book *Historical Revisionism, and Neo-Ustashism – Croatia 1989-2022*? Did Goldstein simply “appropriate” what I assume to be Hutinec’s significant contribution to that article, or did Hutinec perhaps co-author the article “by accident,” just like that, to get something out of it himself?

In his latest book, Goldstein attacks me on several occasions as part of his hunt for revisionists. Amongst other things, he claims that I wrote that Branimir Altgayer, the leader of the German National Assembly in the NDH, politically belonged to the “moderate wing” of the Croatian/Yugoslav German minority:

“Furthermore, [Vladimir] Geiger claims that Branimir Altgayer belonged to the ‘moderate wing of the Volksdeutsche.’ What would be the extreme wing then? More specifically, Altgayer was a key figure in the construction of the German Centre in Osijek, which was financed by looting Osijek’s Jews. He admitted that, within the Volksgruppe, he had been entrusted, throughout the entire course of the war, with ‘rights and responsibilities pertaining to personnel matters and political-ideological education.’ He posed on the cover of the Volksdeutsche newspaper *Neue Zeit*, whose previous covers were adorned by Hitler’s image, along with anti-Semitic caricatures and images of Osijek’s synagogue demolished by the Nazis. If Altgayer was ‘moderate’, what would, according to Geiger, be a ‘radical’ then?”⁵

However, Goldstein’s knowledge of the history of Yugoslav/Croatian Germans (i.e., the Volksdeutsche) is either very modest, insufficient, or – what would be even worse – he deliberately engages in manipulation, that is, conscious deception. In other words, I have never claimed that Altgayer belonged to the “moderate wing of the Volksdeutsche,” least of all in my book *Nijemci u Đakovu i Đakovštini [Germans in Đakovo and Its Surroundings]* to which Goldstein refers. In that book, amongst other things, I write:

⁴ Goldstein, Hutinec, “Kako raskrinkati tvrdnje povijesnih revizionista – pet primjera,” 171.

⁵ Ivo Goldstein, *Povijesni revizionizam i neoustaštvo – Hrvatska 1989. – 2022.* (Zagreb: Fraktura, 2023), 271.

“Judging by all the characteristics and by the restraint of the vast majority of Swabians towards politics, this group was not different in any way from any other ethnic community in the country. However, this changed fundamentally with the emergence of the so-called Renewal Movement (Erneuerungsbewegung). More specifically, in the mid-1930s, a split occurred in the German National Assembly on the political level. The leaders of the new radical movement, the Renewalists (Erneuerer), began to emulate their role models from the Third Reich.”⁶

Immediately after the above, I also write the following about Altgayer:

“Branimir Altgayer, an outstanding Slavonian Renewalist of a more moderate orientation, founded the Cultural and Charitable Association of Germans (Kultur-und Wohlfahrtsvereinigung der Deutschen) in Osijek at the beginning of 1936.”⁷

In other words, I stated that the Renewal Movement was radically orientated, that it was sympathetic to Hitler’s Germany, and that Altgayer was a member of that movement. True, within that radical movement, Altgayer was indeed “more moderate,” but he was still a member of the Renewal Movement. I stand by that assessment to this day.

I did not “defend” the radical and Nazi-orientated Volksdeutsche. In my book *Germans in Đakovo and Its Surroundings*, I extensively write about the anti-Jewish policies of the leadership of the Yugoslav and Croatian Germans from the mid-1930s onwards and during the NDH. Here are three quotes from my book that clearly show how I write about the said topic:

“The situation on the political front changed in 1938, when, under the influence of political circumstances, changes occurred in the views of the German minority, who were increasingly impressed by the growing influence of the Third Reich in Europe. During 1939, the Kulturbund was becoming increasingly aggressive in its activities and pro-Nazi propaganda amongst the German population. Slogans such as ‘Ein Volk, Ein Wille, Ein Weg,’ ‘Ehre, Blut und Boden,’ ‘Ein Deutscher ist er nicht,’ ‘Du bist nichts dein Volk alles’ and the like became more frequent.”⁸

“Following the model of anti-Semitic Nazi propaganda, daily and weekly newspapers in Croatian and German published a series of anti-Semitic articles. The press of the German National Assembly in the Independent State of Croatia (the NDH), including newspapers like *Slawonischer Volksbote* (later *Grenzwacht*), *Neue Zeit*, *Volk am Pflug* and others, called for the persecution of Jews, their exclusion from public life, and the confiscation of their property.”⁹

⁶ Vladimir Geiger, *Nijemci u Đakovu i Đakovštini* (Zagreb: Hrvatski institut za povijest; Dom i svijet, 2001), 125.

⁷ Ibid., 126.

⁸ Ibid., 129.

⁹ Ibid., 147.

“The Jewish temple (synagogue) in Đakovo was set on fire on the evening of 20 April 1941, on the birthday of A.[dolf] Hitler, which was formally commemorated in Đakovo. According to testimonies given by contemporaries, the arson attack was led by members of the German National Assembly, Anton Bartenz and Josef Pintz.”¹⁰

In addition to the aforementioned book, those interested can also read my article on Branimir Altgayter (which Goldstein also references).¹¹ In that article, I explain what the Renewal Movement was, and that Altgayter was a member of this movement. Therefore, I did not write that Altgayter belonged to the “moderate wing of the Volksdeutsche,” as Goldstein, in his ignorance and/or malice, falsely claims.

Goldstein also commented on the book I co-authored with colleagues Mario Jareb and Davor Kovačić, which deals with the manipulations and controversies surrounding the number of victims in the Ustasha camp group Gospić–Jadovno–Pag, which operated in 1941.¹² In a commissarial tone, Goldstein critiques that the authors clearly expressed, “at first glance,” their views on the horrors in these camps, but still did not use the term “genocide,” not even “mass murder,” but rather employed an “utterly undefined term” – “evil events.” Then Goldstein, like a diligent investigator of the People’s Militia, concludes that, in our book, we “focused” on our “only interest” – i.e., establishing the number of detainees and victims – while comrade commissar-inspector reproachfully accuses us of not dealing with the organisation of deportations and the organisation of the Gospić camp group.¹³

However, in that book, before discussing the main topic – i.e., the manipulations and controversies surrounding the number of victims in these camps – we state the following:

“All accounts of the operation of these camps show that they were places of horror, suffering, and the loss of life for a significant number of those who were undesirable to the Ustasha regime in the NDH due to their ethnic/national, religious, or political affiliation. Amongst the victims were women and children, which speaks sufficiently enough about the evil events in these camps. However,

¹⁰ Ibid., 147.

¹¹ Vladimir Geiger, “Saslušanja Branimira Altgaytera vođe Njemačke narodne skupine u Nezavisnoj Državi Hrvatskoj u Upravi državne bezbjednosti za Narodnu Republiku Hrvatsku 1949. Godine,” *Časopis za suvremenu povijest* 31, no. 3 (1999): 576.

¹² Vladimir Geiger, Mario Jareb, Davor Kovačić, *Jadovno i Šaranova jama. Kontroverze i manipulacije* (Zagreb: Hrvatski institut za povijest, 2017).

¹³ Goldstein, *Povijesni revizionizam i neoustaštvo – Hrvatska 1989. – 2022.*, 277.

the research conducted so far has not provided well-founded, unequivocal, and satisfactory answers to the important and unavoidable question of the number of detainees and the number of victims in the Gospić camp group.”¹⁴

We also noted that in the first months after the establishment of the NDH, Gospić was the main reception centre, a “collection camp,” and thus the administrative centre of the Gospić camp group, from where detainees were sent to Velebit Mountain, Jadovno, or the island of Pag, while some were held in Gospić:

“Soon, groups of detainees began arriving, one after another, mostly Serbs, along with Jews. At the same time, the Ustashas began killing detainees around the camps. Jadovno thus served as a transit camp, where the Ustashas brought detainees from various collection camps – the prison in Gospić, the Danica Camp near Koprivnica, and other camps and collection points. From there, after a short stay, they were sent to execution sites on Velebit Mountain. Allegedly, the Ustashas often did not even bring the detainees into the camp, but sent them directly to execution sites.”¹⁵

Based on the above, it is unequivocally clear (except to Goldstein and those of a similar mindset) that we do not deny the “mass murder” committed in the Gospić camp group.

In the introductory part of that book, we provide a history of the Gospić camp group, and list the diverse literature that deals with these camps. We then conclude that which is undeniable – the problem of determining at least an approximate number of the victims in this group of camps remains. Yes, we indeed did not deal with what Goldstein would like us to deal with (i.e., the organisation of deportations to these camps and their organisation) because we explained in the book that we would focus on the manipulations and controversies surrounding the number of victims in these camps. This is clear from the title itself. Why such an approach would be questionable remains unclear to Goldstein and those who share a similar mindset.

Understandably, and fortunately, not all historians are like Goldstein. Zoran Janjetović, PhD, from the Belgrade-based Institute for Recent History of Serbia gave a positive review of the book that I co-authored with Jareb and Kovačić about the Gospić camp group in the journal of that institute, where he notes the following, amongst other things:

¹⁴ Geiger, Jareb, Kovačić, *Jadovno i Šaranova jama*, 12.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 8-9.

“The book by Vladimir Geiger, Mario Jareb, and Davor Kovačić, *Jadovno and Šaranov Pit. Controversies and Manipulations*, will certainly not satisfy the necrophiliac Serbian nationalists, nor is it likely to satisfy the apologetic Croats. However, it offers those with cooler heads plenty of material to think about the method of determining the number of victims in the Gospić camp group, as well as the weaknesses and manipulations that occurred during this process. It is also an invitation of sorts for further research, but with the application of ‘goodwill’ and ‘common sense’ – without which there is no science, nor peace amongst people and nations.”¹⁶

As far as I am aware, this review has not been disputed by Serbian historiography or elsewhere, nor has there been any negative feedback on the mentioned book. It may not be surprising that Goldstein has a different opinion, given that, in the book, we address the estimates of the number of victims of the Jadovno Camp made by his father, Slavko Goldstein. Understandably, Ivo Goldstein repeatedly cites his father’s estimates in his works. We clearly, convincingly, and unequivocally demonstrate that these estimates are both arbitrary and unfounded.¹⁷

Goldstein also reproaches us, like a censor from Orwell’s *1984*, for calling Jadovno a concentration camp, and in a commissarial tone adjudicates:

“Jadovno was not, nor can it be, a ‘concentration camp,’ because it was a ‘death camp,’ since practically no one returned from Jadovno. And so that book turned out to be shameful.”¹⁸

It follows that all those who have so far classified Jadovno as a concentration camp – and there are plenty of those in both Croatian and foreign historiographies – should be declared “revisionists” and “neo-Ustashas,” and their terminology “shameful.” For example, according to the *Croatian Encyclopaedia*, concentration camps are:

“places of mass detention of both domestic or foreign civilian populations (sometimes even soldiers) in isolated larger enclosed areas. Concentration camps are established and maintained by totalitarian or wartime/military regimes to deal with their political opponents. The criteria for detention can be individual, but more often they encompass entire categories of the population (mass political, national, religious, and racial persecutions), and the reasons for detention can be state security, economic exploitation, punishment, and intimidation of the

¹⁶ Zoran Janjetović, “Vladimir Geiger, Mario Jareb, Davor Kovačić. Jadovno i Šaranova jama. Kontroverze i manipulacije. Zagreb: Hrvatski institut za povijest, 2017, 147,” *Tokovi istorije*, br. 2 (2017): 222-223.

¹⁷ Cf. Geiger, Jareb, Kovačić, *Jadovno i Šaranova jama*, 27-28.

¹⁸ Goldstein, *Povijesni revizionizam i neoustaštvo – Hrvatska 1989. – 2022.*, 277.

rest of the population. [...] Concentration camps are built as areas enclosed by fence wire (often electrified), with a dense network of guard towers and buildings (usually barracks, erected quickly to accommodate a large number of people), in which detainees are deprived of all their personal rights, regardless of whether they are so-called penal labour camps or camps in which the physical extermination of detainees is organised (using cold weapons, by shooting, in gas chambers, by starvation, etc.). [...]”¹⁹

So, according to the *Croatian Encyclopaedia*, let me repeat that once again, concentration camps are also those camps in which mass physical extermination, i.e., the killing of detainees, is carried out. As if by pure coincidence, the editor of the history section in that same *Croatian Encyclopaedia* is none other than – Ivo Goldstein. To conclude: first, Goldstein reproaches me (and Jareb, and Kovačić) for calling Jadovno a concentration camp rather than a “death camp,” while the encyclopaedia entry, which had the honour of being edited by that same Goldstein, states that concentration camps are also those camps in which mass liquidations of detainees are carried out.

Goldstein accuses me of writing from the perspective of an “angry revisionist” (referring primarily to his book *Jasenovac*). He writes that my comments on the exhibition *If I Forget You ... The Holocaust in Croatia 1941–1945. Final Destination Auschwitz*, for which he was a consultant, contained “a plethora of harsh, rude, and malicious remarks about alleged ambiguities, omissions, gross inaccuracies, incompetence, sloppiness, ignorance, and ineptitude of so-called Holocaust experts.”²⁰ May I refer to the articles that I wrote on that exhibition,²¹ from which it is easy to conclude whether what I wrote is indeed what Goldstein claims.

Then Goldstein writes and accuses me of the following:

“But ‘in citing publicly available literature and sources on the Ustasha camp in Đakovo, he never felt it necessary to condemn the motives and causes that led to

¹⁹ “koncentracijski logori” [“concentration camps”], *Hrvatska enciklopedija*, online edition, Leksikografski zavod Miroslav Krleža, 2021, accessed on 18 September 2023, <http://www.enciklopedija.hr/Natuknica.aspx?ID=32708>.

²⁰ Goldstein, *Povijesni revizionizam i neoustaštvo – Hrvatska 1989. – 2022.*, 276.

²¹ Vladimir Geiger, “Uz izložbu *Ako tebe zaboravim... Holokaust u Hrvatskoj 1941. – 1945. Zadnje odredište Auschwitz*, Francuski paviljon u Zagrebu, 5. veljače 2020. – 21. travnja 2020.”, accessed February 1, 2024, <http://www.historiografija.hr/?p=19272>; Vladimir Geiger, “Nedostatno znanje, nestručnost i šlamperaj ili još jednom o izložbi *Ako tebe zaboravim... Holokaust u Hrvatskoj 1941. – 1945. / zadnje odredište Auschwitz*, Francuski paviljon u Zagrebu, 5. veljače – 21. travnja 2020.”, *Časopis za suvremenu povijest* 52, no. 1 (2020): 343-350, and Vladimir Geiger, “Uz osvrt Nataše Mataušić i Rajke Bućin u *Časopisu za suvremenu povijest* 52 br. 3 (2020) na moje primjedbe o izložbi *Ako tebe zaboravim ... Holokaust u Hrvatskoj 1941. – 1945.: Zadnje odredište Auschwitz*,” *Časopis za suvremenu povijest* 53, no. 1 (2021): 319-333.

3,000 Jewish women and children being imprisoned in the camp. As state enemies? As 'undesirable' elements? Women? Children? After all, he did not even mention the reasons for the death of 569 of them who died in the camp."²²

It is unclear where Goldstein obtained this quote from, as he references an online article by Nataša Mataušić, in which I am not mentioned at all, and one of my articles.²³ However, it is well known that Goldstein's notes often do not confirm what he mentions or quotes.

Any reasonable person understands and knows that camps, especially for women and children, are an ultimate evil, so Goldstein's appeal to compassion is a weak attack. My criticisms of the exhibition *If I Forget You ...* focus on factual inaccuracies, including those related to the camp itself. I also highlighted that "The Ustasha terror and crimes in the NDH and the Holocaust are too serious a subject, so the exhibition *If I Forget You ... The Holocaust in Croatia 1941-1945. Final Destination Auschwitz* should have been prepared thoughtfully and professionally."²⁴ Moreover, when commenting on the exhibition, I clearly state the following:

"Do we need exhibitions about the Holocaust in the NDH? I repeat: yes, we do, and there is no doubt about that whatsoever."²⁵

I conclude by emphasising that such exhibitions

"should serve as a warning so that evil, great evil, and crimes are not repeated. [...]"²⁶

²² Goldstein, *Povijesni revizionizam i neoustaštvo – Hrvatska 1989. – 2022.*, 276.

²³ Cf. Nataša Mataušić, "Revizionistički pamflet Igora Vukića," accessed February 1, 2024, <https://forum.tm/vijesti/revizionisticki-pamflet-igora-vukica-o-kozarackoj-djeci-5849>, and Geiger, "Uz osvrt Nataše Mataušić i Rajke Bućin u Časopisu za suvremenu povijest 52 (2020), br. 3 na moje primjedbe o izložbi *Ako tebe zaboravim... Holokaust u Hrvatskoj 1941. – 1945.: Zadnje odredište Auschwitz*", 319-333.

²⁴ Geiger, "Nedostatno znanje, nestručnost i šlamperaj ili još jednom o izložbi *Ako tebe zaboravim... Holokaust u Hrvatskoj 1941. – 1945. / zadnje odredište Auschwitz*, Francuski paviljon u Zagrebu, 5. veljače – 21. travnja 2020.," 350.

²⁵ Geiger, "Uz izložbu *Ako tebe zaboravim... Holokaust u Hrvatskoj 1941. – 1945. Zadnje odredište Auschwitz*, Francuski paviljon u Zagrebu, 5. veljače 2020. – 21. travnja 2020.," 1, and Geiger, "Nedostatno znanje, nestručnost i šlamperaj ili još jednom o izložbi *Ako tebe zaboravim... Holokaust u Hrvatskoj 1941. – 1945. / zadnje odredište Auschwitz*, Francuski paviljon u Zagrebu, 5. veljače – 21. travnja 2020.," 350.

²⁶ Geiger, "Uz izložbu *Ako tebe zaboravim... Holokaust u Hrvatskoj 1941. – 1945. Zadnje odredište Auschwitz*, Francuski paviljon u Zagrebu, 5. veljače 2020. – 21. travnja 2020.," 1, and Geiger, "Nedostatno znanje, nestručnost i šlamperaj ili još jednom o izložbi *Ako tebe zaboravim... Holokaust u Hrvatskoj 1941. – 1945. / zadnje odredište Auschwitz*, Francuski paviljon u Zagrebu, 5. veljače – 21. travnja 2020.," 350.

Goldstein also observes that “Geiger calls Jasenovac and Auschwitz ‘concentration camps’ even when discussing deportations which were survived by virtually no one. Therefore, he should have written – ‘death camps.’” Then he asserts:

“It is hard to believe that this is merely a mistake; it is more likely that he tried to minimise or even deny the crime that occurred at these two locations.”²⁷

I find Goldstein’s claim that I “tried to minimise or even deny the crime that occurred” in Jasenovac and Auschwitz extremely vile and offensive. In fact, Goldstein is trying to minimise or even deny the numerous gross inaccuracies and fabrications in his historiographical works, which I have pointed out.

A recent example from Goldstein’s latest book demonstrates how he is allowed to do what others/revisionists are not. He claims that Croatian and Serbian “revisionists,” along with the Ustashas and Chetniks, have chosen, in their “perverse understanding of reality,” biblical terms like “The Way of the Cross” and “Golgotha” for their “supposedly martyr-like fate.”²⁸ However, the term “The Way of the Cross” is fully established in Croatian historiography, and no one questions it; it entered the discourse from folk tradition, and Croatian émigré literature and historiography, where it had been previously used. The term “The Way of the Cross” is also common in Slovenian literature and historiography. The same applies to the term “Golgotha” in Serbian literature and historiography. After all, it wasn’t only innocent people who partook in either the biblical “Way of the Cross” or “Golgotha”. That is why the use of these terms is justified in describing the events at the end of World War II. But, if the above is a “perverse understanding of reality” for Goldstein, how is it that he himself uses the biblical term “The Way of the Cross” in all his numerous works, articles, and books when discussing the events at the end of World War II? Perhaps historian Goldstein forgot, or is he just pretending to be ignorant? May I remind him that, for example, in 2007, in the collection of papers titled *Bleiburg i Križni put 1945* [*Bleiburg and The Way of the Cross in 1945*], he published an article titled “Povijesne okolnosti Bleiburga i Križnog puta” [“The Historical Circumstances of Bleiburg and The Way of the Cross,”] and that in 2019, in the collection of papers titled *Hrvatska na kraju rata 1945* [*Croatia at the End of the War in 1945*], he published the article “Bleiburg i Križni put” [“Bleiburg and The Way of the Cross”]. In addition, the chapters titled “Rasap i slom NDH, Bleiburg i Križni put” [“The Collapse and Fall of the NDH, Bleiburg, and The Way of the Cross”] and “Bleiburg i Križni put – zaslužena kazna ili zločinački pokolj?” [“Bleiburg and The Way of the Cross –

²⁷ Goldstein, *Povijesni revizionizam i neustaštvo – Hrvatska 1989. – 2022.*, 276-277.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, 395-396.

Deserved Punishment or Criminal Massacre?"] are chapters from his books.²⁹ Perhaps Ivo Goldstein himself is prone to perversions.

It is not surprising that, in his latest work, Goldstein defends his previous masterpiece, the book *Jasenovac*.³⁰ He responded to my negative review of *Jasenovac*, which was published on the pages of this journal, claiming that my contestations of his book were "superficial and unsubstantiated." To strengthen his argument, he even referred to Nataša Mataušić, PhD. Goldstein writes:

"After my book *Jasenovac* was published in 2018, [Vladimir] Geiger responded with something that was presumably supposed to be a critical review. He did not challenge any of the fundamental theses presented in the book, nor any of the elements that make up the skeleton of the story, but instead devoted himself to superficial and unsubstantiated criticism. In writing a text full of rage, he reduced it, as Nataša Mataušić says, to 'counting and listing all the missing commas and double spaces between words, spelling mistakes, and possibly misaligned annotations.'"³¹

In not wanting to deviate from the topic at hand, there is no need to explain the course of my debate with Nataša Mataušić (and Rajka Bućin, PhD) on the pages of this journal during 2020 and 2021. In short, Mataušić and Bućin reduce my critical review of Goldstein's book *Jasenovac* to merely counting spelling errors.³² Goldstein, of course, agrees with their assessment.

²⁹ Cf. Ivo Goldstein, "Povijesne okolnosti Bleiburga i Križnog puta," in: *Bleiburg i Križni put 1945. Zbornik radova*, ed. Juraj Hrženjak (Zagreb: Savez antifašističkih boraca i antifašista Republike Hrvatske, 2007), 31-37; Ivo Goldstein, "Bleiburg i Križni put," in *Hrvatska na kraju rata 1945*, ed. Miroslav Kirinčić (Zagreb: Savez antifašističkih boraca i antifašista Republike Hrvatske, 2019), 9-213, and Ivo Goldstein, *Hrvatska 1918 – 2008*. (Zagreb: Novi Liber, 2008), 350-368 (chapter: "Rasap i slom NDH, Bleiburg i Križni put"); Ivo Goldstein, *Povijest Hrvatske 1945-2011.*, vol. 1 (1945-1968.) (Zagreb: EPH Media d.o.o., Jutarnji list, 2011), 14-38 (chapter: "Rasap i slom NDH, Bleiburg i Križni put"); Slavko Goldstein, Ivo Goldstein, *Jasenovac i Bleiburg nisu isto* (Zagreb: Novi Liber, 2011), 133-161 (chapter: "Rasap i slom NDH, Bleiburg i Križni put"); Ivo Goldstein, *Kontroverze hrvatske povijesti 20. stoljeća* (Zagreb: Profil, 2019), 149-165 (chapter: "Bleiburg i Križni put – zaslužena kazna ili zločinački pokolj?").

³⁰ Ivo Goldstein, *Jasenovac* (Zaprešić; Jasenovac: Fraktura; Javna ustanova Spomen područje Jasenovac, 2018) and/or Ivo Goldstein, *Jasenovac* (Novi Sad: Akademski književni, 2019).

³¹ Goldstein, *Povijesni revizionizam i neoustaštvo – Hrvatska 1989. – 2022.*, 273.

³² Nataša Mataušić, Rajka Bućin, "Dopustite ljudima da vam kažu i krenite svojim putem: osvrt na tekstove Vladimira Geigera o izložbi *Ako tebe zaboravim... Holokaust u Hrvatskoj 1941. – 1945.: Zadnje odredište Auschwitz*", *Časopis za suvremenu povijest* 52 (2020), no. 3: 1011. Cf. Geiger, "Uz osvrt Nataše Mataušić i Rajke Bućin u *Časopisu za suvremenu povijest* 52 (2020), br. 3 na moje primjedbe o izložbi *Ako tebe zaboravim... Holokaust u Hrvatskoj 1941. – 1945.: Zadnje odredište Auschwitz*", 333.

In other words, Goldstein, Mataušić, and Bućin consider my criticisms of Goldstein's book *Jasenovac* trivial, reducing them to correcting typing errors and unnecessary commas. On the other hand, I believe that, in 2019, I presented a series of substantive remarks about that book on 45 pages in this journal, and pointed out its numerous shortcomings. I will once again focus solely on one of Goldstein's charlatan claims, which he shamelessly pushed in parallel with his book *Jasenovac*.

It all started when Goldstein made a claim in the weekly *Globus* from 5 May 2018 to explain what happened to the many corpses, of which there were, according to Goldstein, at least 90,000 to 100,000 in the Jasenovac Camp:

“At the very end of the war, in early April 1945, several of Jasenovac's most notorious butchers returned to Jasenovac after two to two and a half years because they knew the exact locations of the mass graves. The order was given ‘to destroy the traces of the graves at all costs.’ [...] Machines that crushed the bones of the corpses were brought in from the [German] Reich.”³³

After warming up in the weekly *Globus*, Goldstein went all out on 17 June 2018, on Croatian television, in a show called *Nedjeljom u 2*, by stating the following:

“[Miroslav] Filipović Majstorović [...] knew the graves best. He went to Chełmno, to be instructed by the Nazis how to destroy corpses, and they even brought in machines that crush bones. [...] They destroyed the bones that they found, or rather excavated [in Jasenovac] with those machines.”³⁴

After these confabulations, Goldstein – as is well known, and as I have already written – makes no mention of the bone-crushing machine in his book *Jasenovac* at all. Obviously, he did not mention that the Ustasha officer Filipović Majstorović went to the German camp Chełmno to get instructions, nor that the Ustashes brought such machines to Jasenovac because the claims that Goldstein had made in the weekly *Globus* and on Croatian television are charlatan fabrications, lies, something that any reasonable and honest person, let alone a tenured university professor, should be ashamed of.

In the summer of 2021, the *Jerusalem Post* published an article that criticises Goldstein (authored by David Goldman, an obviously fictitious identity). The article mentions, amongst other things, Goldstein's fabrication about the

³³ Ivo Goldstein, “Komisija za Jasenovac: nova besmislena inicijativa šefice države,” accessed January 15, 2024, <https://www.jutarnji.hr/globus/pise-ivo-goldstein-komisija-za-jasenovac-nova-besmislena-inicijativa-sefice-drzave-7321071>.

³⁴ “NU2 – IVO GOLDSTEIN”, accessed February 5, 2019, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-2c79KryKCM>.

bone-crushing machine that the Ustashas allegedly brought to the Jasenovac camp at the end of the war. This is the “explanation” that Goldstein gives to the daily *Večernji list* at that time:

“[...] in the TV show *Nedjeljom u 2*, he presented the hypothesis that corpses were destroyed using a bone-crushing device, which the Nazis used in the camps as part of the well-known ‘Sonderaktion 1005,’ and that the Ustashas, it is no secret, closely collaborated with the Nazis in that regard as well.”³⁵

Understandably, Goldstein only clarified the ease with which he can lie. He did not present a “hypothesis” in the TV show *Nedjeljom u 2* that the corpses in Jasenovac were destroyed by a bone-crushing device; he presented it as a fact, as is evident from the previously cited quote.

At this point, I must digress. As I have already mentioned, in the summer of 2021, news about Goldman and Goldstein, the *Jerusalem Post* and the bone-crushing machine spread across Croatia’s media space. Unless I missed something, in that entire media storm in a teacup, I did not notice that Vlado Vurušić and Robert Bajruši, journalists from the daily *Jutarnji list*, or writer Miljenko Jergović, wrote anything about it. Although always ready to act as itinerant news readers eager to support or defend Goldstein the agitprop, they suddenly fell silent when the issue of the bone-crushing machine, invented by Goldstein, was raised.

And then comes Mataušić, PhD, (and Bućin, PhD), who righteously concludes that I am unable to find any mistakes in Goldstein’s work, and only correct his use of commas. I would kindly recommend to Mataušić, PhD, and Bućin, PhD, to go on an expedition to Lonjsko Polje together with Goldstein; they might just chance upon the bone-crushing machine, which the Ustashas brought from Germany.

Meanwhile, of course, Goldstein does not relent, and so, even in this book, as a mighty alchemist of Croatian historiography, he attempts to turn his speculations about the remains of the victims of Jasenovac into facts:

“[...] In some of the probes excavated in the mid-1960s, alongside traces of burnt material, small bone fragments were found, which indicates that the bones were not only cremated, but were also systematically crushed because they could not be completely destroyed by fire. [...] The described method of eliminating traces of crimes is identical to the practice developed in the death camp at Chełmno as part of ‘Sonderaktion 1005,’ in which from 1942 onwards, the traces of Nazi

³⁵ Petra Maretić Žonja, “Polemika o Jasenovcu. Goldstein: Tekst u Jerusalem Postu je hrpa besmislica i laži, iskopavanjem leševa u Jasenovcu ništa se neće postići,” accessed January 15, 2024, <https://www.vecernji.hr/vijesti/goldstein-tekst-u-u-jerusalem-postu-je-hrpa-besmislica-i-lazi-a-autor-mi-je-nepoznat-1515905>.

crimes were systematically destroyed in occupied Poland, the USSR, and even in Serbia. It is possible to estimate the number of cremated corpses based on the Bežec death camp example: the capacity of a single cremation pyre there, staffed by 300 prisoners, was 2,000 corpses in 24 hours; later, another was built, meaning that in Bežec up to 4,000 corpses could be cremated daily. If a similar method was employed in Jasenovac on its four cremation pyres (which is the number mentioned by Berger), twice as many corpses could be cremated. In other words, the number of cremated corpses could be counted in the thousands.”³⁶

“In some of the probes excavated” (what about the other probes?), “which indicates” (what if it indicates something else?), “If a similar method was employed” (what if it was not?), “could be” (what if it could not be?), “could be counted” (what if they could not be counted?). What can one say? I actually have to agree with Goldstein when he claims that revisionists use “distortions, and even fabrications of facts, as well as various forms of manipulation and mystification.”³⁷

Then again, perhaps Mataušić, PhD, (and Bućin, PhD) is right; I am being petty, focusing on details. I cannot help myself. When I reviewed Goldstein’s book *Jasenovac* in 2020 on the pages of this journal, I pointed out that he was not familiar with accurate data even on some of the most important published sources on that camp. For instance, Goldstein writes:

“The main and most comprehensive published source for the history of the Jasenovac camp complex are three books edited by Antun Miletić [...]”³⁸

When I pointed out in my review that Miletić had actually published four (4) and not three (3) volumes of documents about the Jasenovac camp, Goldstein corrected his inaccurate statement in the Serbian edition of his book *Jasenovac*, published in 2019, managing to write the number correctly:

“The main and most comprehensive published source for the history of the Jasenovac camp complex are four books edited by Antun Miletić [...]”³⁹

However, such accuracy is apparently too burdensome for a renaissance creator like Goldstein to maintain in the long run. Thus, in his latest book, he once again scrupulously mentions the “three-volume book by Antun Miletić.”⁴⁰

³⁶ Goldstein, *Povijesni revizionizam i neoustaštvo – Hrvatska 1989. – 2022.*, 320.

³⁷ Goldstein, Hutinec, “Kako raskrinkati tvrdnje povijesnih revizionista – pet primjera,” 196.

³⁸ Goldstein, *Jasenovac* (Zaprešić; Jasenovac, 2018), 30.

³⁹ Goldstein, *Jasenovac* (Novi Sad, 2019), 30.

⁴⁰ Goldstein, *Povijesni revizionizam i neoustaštvo – Hrvatska 1989. – 2022.*, 455.

The reviewer of Goldstein's book *Historical Revisionism, and Neo-Ustasism – Croatia 1989-2022* was Ivo Graovac, PhD, whose name is printed incorrectly; in fact, it is printed incorrectly twice, i.e., both times that his name is mentioned. Since no person by that name has ever existed in the humanities, it must undoubtedly be Igor Graovac, PhD, whose name neither Goldstein nor his faithful publisher Fraktura can spell correctly. But who cares, as long as his name is Ivo.

In his book, historian Goldstein presents his mannerist view of the state of research in contemporary Croatian historiography, and triumphantly and manipulatively asserts the following:

“An important indicator of revisionist manipulation is the fate of the project ‘Croatia’s Human Losses in World War II and the Post-War Period,’ which was initiated in 1991 under the leadership of Mihael Sobolevski and Zdravko Dizdar. Vladimir Geiger took over in 2002. In 2005, Dizdar wrote that ‘within the framework of Geiger’s project, research continues that should result in a list of all the war and post-war victims in Croatia, including those of Bleiburg and the death marches.’ However, in all these years that Geiger has led the project, he has published neither a comprehensive calculation nor a list of the victims. Is this because such calculations would evidently not suit certain circles who would thereby lose the foundation of the myths about hundreds of thousands of killed Croats at Bleiburg and the death marches? In the meantime, Geiger received the Ljubica Štefan Award for his book *Josip Broz Tito and War Crimes*, and for the project on victims, that is, for a project whose results, even after 32 years of work, have not been published.”⁴¹

After the book was published, Goldstein explained in the press that, since the 1990s:

“[...] projects that do not provide a clear answer to the previous question have been favoured; they receive money, hire new people... For example, the big project ‘Victims of World War II and the Post-War Period’ [*sic!*] conducted at the Croatian Institute of History in all these 30 years has not led to the creation of a list nor has it, at the very least, produced an approximate number of the victims, which is not only a curiosity, but also a disgrace to the profession: a vast amount of state money has been spent while the fundamental goal of the project has not been achieved.”⁴²

⁴¹ Ibid., 262-263.

⁴² Boris Pavelić, “IVO GOLDSTEIN: ‘Zvuči grubo, ali revizionističke i neoustaške laži jednostavno su povijesna pornografija,’” accessed January 22, 2024, <https://www.nacional.hr/ivo-goldstein-zvuci-grubo-ali-revizionisticke-i-neoustaške-lazi-jednostavno-su-povijesna-pornografija/>.

But once again, Goldstein has mixed up everything he could, imputing and manipulating, because neither the leader of the institute's project on Croatia's human losses in World War II and the post-war period nor the historians of the Croatian Institute of History who collaborated on the project were tasked with compiling a nominal list of the victims of World War II and the post-war period.

A few facts would not be amiss here. – At the Croatian Institute of History (then the Institute for Contemporary History), the research project titled “Croatia's Human Losses in World War II and the Post-War Period” has been conducted since 1991 with the support of the Ministry of (then) Science and Technology. From 1991 to 1995, it was led by Mihael Sobolevski, PhD, and project collaborators included: Igor Graovac, Zdravko Dizdar, Gojko Vezmar, Narcisa Lengel-Krizman, and Slobodan Žarić.⁴³ Then, from 1996 to 2002, the project of the Croatian Institute of History titled “Croatia's Actual Human Losses in World War II” was led by Dizdar, PhD. The project's consultant was Sobolevski, PhD, and the researchers were Graovac, PhD, and Žarić, PhD.⁴⁴ Throughout this time, i.e., from 1991 onwards, the fundamental tasks of the project's collaborators-researchers and historians of the Croatian Institute of History were scientific research of various questions and topics agreed upon for each project period, the publication of scientific articles and books, and participation in national and international scientific conferences. The same has been true since 2002, when I took the helm of the institute's projects on Croatia's human losses in World War II and the post-war period.⁴⁵ Since then, a series of new research questions and topics have been systematically addressed. Ample participation in scientific conferences by project collaborators, and the publication of many scientific articles, monographs/books, and collections of documents testify to the extensive scientific bibliography of the historians of the Croatian Institute of History, the collaborators-researchers on these projects (Vladimir Geiger, Zdravko Dizdar, Martina Grahek Ravanić, Marica Karakaš Obradov, and, in recent times, new researchers as well),

⁴³ Cf. “Ministarstvo znanosti i tehnologije / SVIBOR – Prikupljanje podataka o projektima u RH / Šifra projekta: 6-02-101, Ljudski gubici Hrvatske u drugom svjetskom ratu,” accessed September 20, 2023, http://mzos.hr/svibor/6/02/101/proj_h.htm.

⁴⁴ Cf. “Ministarstvo znanosti, obrazovanja i športa / [Z] projekti / Arhiva projekata (1996. – 2002.)” accessed on 20 September 2023, http://zprojekti.mzos.hr/zProjektiOld/arh_det.asp?offset=30&ID=36.

⁴⁵ Cf. “Hrvatski institut za povijest / Ljudski gubici Hrvatske u drugom svjetskom ratu i poraću / Šifra projekta 019-0190609-0584,” accessed September 20, 2023, <https://www.isp.hr/odjeli/odjel-za-suvremenu-povijest/ljudski-gubici/>, and *Pola stoljeća prošlosti. Hrvatski institut za povijest (1961. – 2011.)*, ed. Zdenko Radelić and Jasna Turkalj (Zagreb: Hrvatski institut za povijest, 2021), 65, 67, 78-80, 90, 107, 110.

as was the case with previous institute projects on human losses in World War II conducted during the 1990s.⁴⁶

All project reports on Croatia's human losses in World War II (and the post-war period) since the 1990s have been highly positively evaluated, and all the scientists, historians, have been regularly promoted to higher scientific titles based on their research and work accomplishments.

Numerous scientific papers, articles, books, and collections of documents have been published on World War II and the post-war period, covering topics such as the victims of Ustasha and Chetnik crimes in the NDH, camps like Danica, Jadovno, and Jasenovac, the victims of Allied air raids and bombings in Croatia during World War II, forced migrations of populations – Croats, Slovenes, Serbs, Jews, and Germans – during World War II and the post-war period in Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina, as well as numerous scientific papers, articles, books, and collections of documents on partisan and communist repression and crimes at the end of World War II and in the immediate post-war period, Bleiburg and “The Way of the Cross,” camps for the Volksdeutsche in Croatia after World War II, the activities of the State Commission on Occupier and Collaborator Crimes, and the courts for the protection of the national honour of Croats and Serbs in Croatia. – That these or most of these works by the historians of the Croatian Institute of History are not to the taste of Goldstein and his ilk, whether in terms of their titles or in terms of their contents, is their problem indeed.

In the description of the scientific project of the Croatian Institute of History titled “Croatia's Human Losses in World War II and the Post-War Period,” which is available online as well, a nominal list of victims is also mentioned. It is clearly stated that:

“A separate, both research and technical, part of the project is the topic titled “List of Victims of World War II and the Post-War Period” (Josip Kolanović, PhD).” [...]

“Within the framework of this topic, sources on the human losses of Croatia and of Croats in World War II and the post-war period will be researched, and the lists compiled earlier will be supplemented and corrected. Ultimately, a database of the human losses in World War II and the post-war period will be created, and the entries will include data on the human losses and victims, the place, time, and manner in which they lost their lives, and the data source. Given that the

⁴⁶ Cf. “CROSBI – Hrvatska znanstvena bibliografija,” accessed September 20, 2023, <https://www.bib.irb.hr:8443/>; *Bibliografija Hrvatskog instituta za povijest (1961. – 2011.)*, ed. Darija Pancirov and Maja Štignjedec (Zagreb: Hrvatski institut za povijest, 2011); and *Bibliografija Hrvatskog instituta za povijest (2011. – 2020.)*, ed. Darija Pancirov and Martina Jurčić (Zagreb: Hrvatski institut za povijest, 2021).

number of human losses and victims is large, and given the reliability of existing lists, and the availability of sources, this research is a continuation and part of a long-term research effort whose goal is to create reliable and comprehensive records of the human losses in World War II and the post-war period. In addition to verifying, correcting, and supplementing the data of existing lists, areas that are poorly documented and potential sources of their data will be identified. The completion of this research will create the conditions for completing the list of human losses in World War II and the post-war period. It is estimated that the total number of human losses that can be recorded is several hundred thousand. Considering the available sources, within the framework of this research, the data of 80-90% of the human losses and victims will be processed. By consolidating data from various lists, verifying the data in original archival material, and using new sources, the completeness and reliability of the data will be ensured, as far as available sources allow, thus preventing the arbitrary interpretation of the data. The completion of this research will create the conditions for further scientific research, particularly in certain narrower research areas and problems, for verifying existing hypotheses that have been presented in science and to the public, as well as for a comprehensive assessment of the causes, the manifestations, and the social, demographic, and political consequences of wartime fatalities.⁴⁷

The nominal list or database, on which Josip Kolanović, PhD, and his collaborators have worked since 2002 within the framework of the project “Croatia’s Human Losses in World War II and the Post-War Period,” and which he has led independently – it must be highlighted – has nothing to do with the nominal list of what is called Vukojević’s Commission (i.e., the Commission for Identification of World War II and Post-War Victims of Croatia), as noted scrupulously by Goldstein.⁴⁸ Contrary to Goldstein’s delusions, it is indeed a database of the nominal list compiled by the War Victims’ Registry Commission of the Federal Executive Council of Yugoslavia from 1964, which Kolanović, PhD, and his collaborators corrected and supplemented with new entries.

Goldstein mentions that, in 2002, Kolanović, PhD, initiated the project “Victims of World War II, the Post-War Period, and the Homeland War” at the Croatian State Archives, whose director he was, “but the project’s implementation was practically ‘prevented’ two years later within the CSA itself.”⁴⁹ What Goldstein should have, in fact, mentioned is that Kolanović, PhD, was “housed” at that time at the Croatian Institute of History to continue his work on the nominal list of victims with his collaborators.

⁴⁷ “Hrvatski institut za povijest / Ljudski gubici Hrvatske u drugom svjetskom ratu i poraću / Šifra projekta 019-0190609-0584,” accessed October 21, 2023, <https://www.isp.hr/odjeli/odjel-za-suvremenu-povijest/ljudski-gubici/>.

⁴⁸ Cf. Goldstein, *Povijesni revizionizam i neoustaštvo – Hrvatska 1989. – 2022.*, 265.

⁴⁹ Cf. *Ibid.*

At the Croatian Institute of History, all interested parties have been granted access to the database and use of its data. These included, for example, Dobroslav Paraga, who, for personal purposes, requested access to the entries of his family members who lost their lives in the Holocaust during the NDH period, to László Horváth, PhD, from the Society of Hungarian Artists and Scientists in Croatia for research purposes and work on a nominal list of Croatian Hungarians who lost their lives during World War II and the post-war period. Historians and researchers engaged in the institute's project have used the data from this nominal list in their works, which would have been clear to Goldstein had he closely followed the scientific works produced within the framework of the project. Moreover, based on some scientific articles, the Jasenovac Memorial Site corrected the data in its nominal database of the victims of the Jasenovac and Stara Gradiška camps, as in the case of, for example, the villages Malo and Veliko Nabrđe. We are not aware that Goldstein previously expressed interest in this nominal list. Now, however, as the more intelligent would note, he does so for specific purposes. Finally, the reason why this database or nominal list is not available online is quite simple: despite numerous efforts, the Croatian Institute of History has not received sufficient financial resources from the competent ministry needed to edit and make the database available online.

The scientific papers, articles, and books produced within the framework of the project "Croatia's Human Losses in World War II and the Post-War Period" have greatly contributed to the work on the database or the nominal list of human losses in World War II and the post-war period. The data from this nominal list have been extensively used in the production of scientific work, articles, and books within the framework of the project "Croatia's Human Losses in World War II and the Post-War Period."⁵⁰ Furthermore, the projects

⁵⁰ Due to the fact that numerous works have been produced within the framework of the project "Croatia's Human Losses in World War II and the Post-War Period," the list that I am here providing is a list of only the most important ones that I have (co-)authored: *Partizanska i komunistička represija i zločini u Hrvatskoj 1944. – 1946. Dokumenti*, ed. Zdravko Dizdar et al. (Slavonski Brod: Hrvatski institut za povijest, Podružnica za povijest Slavonije, Srijema i Baranje, 2005); *Partizanska i komunistička represija i zločini u Hrvatskoj 1944. – 1946. Dokumenti. Slavonija, Srijem i Baranja*, ed. Vladimir Geiger et al. (Slavonski Brod: Hrvatski institut za povijest, Podružnica za povijest Slavonije, Srijema i Baranje, 2006); *Partizanska i komunistička represija i zločini u Hrvatskoj 1944. – 1946. Dokumenti. Zagreb i središnja Hrvatska*, ed. Vladimir Geiger et al. (Slavonski Brod; Zagreb: Hrvatski institut za povijest, Podružnica za povijest Slavonije, Srijema i Baranje; Hrvatski institut za povijest, 2008); *Partizanska i komunistička represija i zločini u Hrvatskoj 1944. – 1946. Dokumenti. Dalmacija*, eds. Mate Rupić and Vladimir Geiger (Slavonski Brod; Zagreb: Hrvatski institut za povijest, Podružnica za povijest Slavonije, Srijema i Baranje; Hrvatski institut za povijest, 2011); Vladimir Geiger, *Logor Krndija 1945. – 1946.* (Zagreb; Slavonski Brod: Hrvatski institut za povijest; Hrvatski institut za povijest, Podružnica za povijest Slavonije, Srijema i Baranje, 2008); *Dokument i o*

of the Croatian Institute of History on Croatia's human losses in World War II and the post-war period have resulted in dozens of scientific articles and approximately twenty scientific books and document collections.⁵¹ In other words, Goldstein once again misleads the uninformed with the claims that he makes.

In short, Goldstein concludes the following about me and my historiographical work: "Vladimir Geiger systematically distorts the history of World

zločinima 12. proleterske brigade XII. udarne divizije III. jugoslavenske armije u selima kotara Donji Andrijevići početkom studenoga 1945., eds. Mate Rupić, Vladimir Geiger and Branko Ostajmer (Slavonski Brod: Hrvatski institut za povijest, Podružnica za povijest Slavonije, Srijema i Baranje, 2016); Vladimir Geiger, Pero Šola, "Žrtvoslov Malog Nabrđa – Drugi svjetski rat i poraće. Pokušaj revizije podataka o ljudskim gubitcima nestalog i zaboravljenog slavonskog sela," *Scrinia Slavonica* 17 (2017): 291-378; Vladimir Geiger, *Velika Pisanica 1945. Sabirni, radni i prolazni logor za folksdojčere* (Zagreb: Hrvatski institut za povijest; Ogranak Matice hrvatske u Bjelovaru, 2020); Vladimir Geiger, Branko Ostajmer, "Đakovo i Đakovština u danima Travanjskoga rata i uspostave Nezavisne Države Hrvatske: o žrtvama Đakovčana i Đakovštinaca i o njihovim sudbinama u historiografiji, publicistici i žrtvoslovima," *Zbornik Muzeja Đakovštine* 15 (2021): 195-277.

⁵¹ The following list of scientific books and collections of documents is just as important as the one I have provided in the previous footnote: Zdravko Dizdar, Mihael Sobolevski, *Prešućivani četnički zločini u Hrvatskoj i u Bosni i Hercegovini: 1941. – 1945.* (Zagreb: Hrvatski institut za povijest; Dom i svijet, 1999); Zdravko Dizdar, *Četnički zločini u Bosni i Hercegovini: 1941. – 1945.* (Zagreb: Hrvatski institut za povijest; Dom i svijet, 2002); Marica Karakaš Obradov, *Angloamerička bombardiranja Hrvatske u Drugom svjetskom ratu: saveznički zračni napadi na Nezavisnu Državu Hrvatsku 1943. – 1945.* (Zagreb: Hrvatski institut za povijest, 2008); Martina Grahek Ravančić, *Bleiburg i Križni put 1945.: historiografija, publicistika i memoarska literatura* (Zagreb: Hrvatski institut za povijest, 2009); Martina Grahek Ravančić, *Narod će im suditi: Zemaljska komisija za utvrđivanje zločina okupatora i njihovih pomagača za Zagreb 1944. – 1947.* (Zagreb: Hrvatski institut za povijest, 2013); Vladimir Geiger, *Josip Broz Tito i ratni zločini. Bleiburg – Folksdojčeri* (Zagreb: Hrvatski institut za povijest, 2013); Marica Karakaš Obradov, *Novi mozaici nacija u „novim poredcima”: migracije stanovništva na hrvatskom području tijekom Drugoga svjetskog rata i poraća* (Zagreb: Hrvatski institut za povijest, 2014); Vladimir Geiger, *Radni logor Šipovac – Našice 1945. – 1946.* (Našice: Zavičajni muzej Našice; Udruga Nijemaca i Austrijanaca Našice, 2015); Zdravko Dizdar, *Logor Danica u Koprivnici 1941. – 1942.*, vols. 1 & 2, Documents (Koprivnica: Muzej grada Koprivnice; Bogadigrafika, 2017); Vladimir Geiger, Mario Jareb, Davor Kovačić, *Jadovno i Šaranova jama. Kontroverze i manipulacije* (Zagreb: Hrvatski institut za povijest, 2017); Vladimir Geiger, Suzana Leček, *Krivnja i kazna. Politika odmazde i sudski proces ministru u Vladi NDH Živanu Kuveždiću 1948. – 1949.* (Slavonski Brod: Hrvatski institut za povijest, Podružnica za povijest Slavonije, Srijema i Baranje, 2018); Vladimir Geiger, Pero Šola, Marko Krznarić, *Groblje hrvatskih vojnika na Mirogoju, Zagreb, 1941. – 1945. O uklanjanju u poraću 1945. – 1946. grobalja i grobova „okupatora” i „narodnih neprijatelja” poginulih 1941. – 1945. u Nezavisnoj Državi Hrvatskoj* (Zagreb: Hrvatski institut za povijest, 2022); Martina Grahek Ravančić, *U ime naroda! Djelovanje sudova za zaštitu nacionalne časti Hrvata i Srba u Hrvatskoj 1945. godine* (Zagreb: Hrvatski institut za povijest, 2023).

War II, but in a more subtle way, by putting his nationalist spin on it. [...]”⁵² This is how the way things are when Goldstein is on the “right side of history.” He gets to label and brand not only me, but also numerous other historians from the Croatian Institute of History, whose historiographical work he disapproves of because it opposes his views and opinions – as nationalists, right-wingers, neo-Ustashes, prominent revisionists, etc. After all, Goldstein has the right to think whatever he wants about me, other historians and their work (which he labels as “mythologisations, mystifications, and manipulations of past times”), but he should not – at the very least – present inaccuracies. I doubt that he is capable of it, so I can only conclude that I would be surprised, and truly concerned, if Goldstein were to praise me.

And finally, Ivo Goldstein is indeed modest in his knowledge that he is the infallible, scrupulous, and undeniable expert on all questions of modern Croatian history, and much more. Hardly anyone can match his expertise. Nevertheless, even in this book, he, of course, does not miss the opportunity to express admiration for his late Father, who, alongside him, the Son Ivo, is the only one worthy of admiration. In other words, Goldstein modestly praises himself and his father.

For Goldstein, everything is simple, black or white. There are no shades of grey. He knows well who the villains, the revisionists, are, and who the good guys are. That’s all we really need, don’t we?

Translated by Ana Janković

⁵² Goldstein, *Povijesni revizionizam i neoustaštvo – Hrvatska 1989. – 2022.*, 270.

