

Professor Medzhibovskaya chooses not to respond.

To the Editor:

In her review of *Serbia and the Serbs in World War Two*, which I coedited with Ola Listhaug, Emily Greble makes several errors (vol. 72, no. 1). First, she claims that our volume “refutes Serbian narratives”—a bigger claim than we would make. Our aspiration was to offer an objective account of the Serbian front in the war, as an alternative to such pro-Axis narratives as have been circulating in Serbia, ones that have been employed to support calls for the posthumous rehabilitation of Axis collaborators Milan Nedić and Draža Mihailović. Second, ignoring both my introduction and my chapter with Sladjana Lazić on the Nedić regime, she urges that our volume is motivated by a desire to “pin blame on Serbs.” Yet, in my introduction, in summarizing Marko Hoare’s chapter, I wrote that “the majority of Partisans were Serbs” (7)—a point documented in detail in Hoare’s chapter. Moreover, in my 2006 article, “The NDH—An Introduction,” which Greble cited in her article published in an earlier issue of *Slavic Review* (vol. 68, no. 1, p. 120, note 14), I wrote, “The NDH regime was the most brutal and most sanguinary satellite regime in the Axis sphere of influence during the Second World War. From time to time there have been those wanting either to white-wash the NDH or to equate the Serbian collaborationist state of Milan Nedić with the NDH . . . Both of these theses must be rejected” (399). That should scarcely suggest a desire on my part to “pin blame on Serbs.” Third, Greble expresses complete disagreement with Listhaug’s conclusion—which she erroneously claimed I cosigned—for, in her words, Serbia’s alleged qualification as “‘a unique case’ in its political investment in and manipulation of history.” What Listhaug wrote is that “Serbia is *not* a special case in that World War Two is a topic to this day . . . ; it is in the intensity of the discussions and the attempts at sweeping historical revisionism that Serbia is a unique case in contemporary Europe” (285, emphasis added). Written before Hungary sank into its present revisionist mire, those words were an accurate portrayal of the situation as of spring 2010. Moreover, in my introduction, I noted that debates about World War II, similar to those in Serbia, have been taking place in Norway, France, Croatia, Hungary, and Romania. In fact, Greble’s reference to “similarly problematic revisionist and politicized histories” merely confirms Listhaug’s affirmation that “Serbia is not a special case in that World War Two is a topic to this day.” Finally, Greble looked for a chapter devoted to Jasenovac in a book about Serbia; I included a chapter on Jasenovac in my edited volume, *Nezavisna Država Hrvatska 1941.–1945.* (2009) because Jasenovac is, in the first place, part of the history of the NDH. Our volume on Serbia already includes a chapter on *the debate* about Jasenovac; to have added a second chapter devoted to Jasenovac would not have been appropriate.

SABRINA P. RAMET

*The Norwegian University of Science and Technology*

Professor Greble chooses not to respond.