

From the *Slavic Review* Editorial Board:

Slavic Review publishes signed letters to the editor by individuals with educational or research merit. Where the letter concerns a publication in *Slavic Review*, the author of the publication will be offered an opportunity to respond. Space limitations dictate that comment regarding a book review should be restricted to one paragraph of no more than 250 words; comment on an article or forum should not exceed 750 to 1,000 words. When we receive many letters on a topic, some letters will be published on the *Slavic Review* Web site with opportunities for further discussion. Letters may be submitted by e-mail, but a signed copy on official letterhead or with a complete return address must follow. The editor reserves the right to refuse to print, or to publish with cuts, letters that contain personal abuse or otherwise fail to meet the standards of debate expected in a scholarly journal.

To the Editor:

In her review of my book *Aspects of Balkan Culture: Social, Political, and Literary Perceptions* (vol. 68, no. 1), Wendy Bracewell mainly discusses the *contents* of my book. There is no discussion of the ideas that I have entertained or the novelty of my approach in presenting the issues related to the Eastern Question or any other chosen topic in this book.

Contrary to Bracewell's laconic assertions that I presented the opinions of Fedor Dostoevskii, Lev Tolstoi, and Alexander II as sharing identical attitudes, I have amply documented the positions of the Russian state policies of *recueillement*. Alexander II directed his principal attention toward domestic affairs and aimed to avoid foreign policy entanglements in the Balkans.

Bracewell even doubted that the Bulgarian people suffered great losses during the Eastern Crisis. Her overarching assumptions do not correspond to my assessment. I have also relied on William E. Gladstone's *Bulgarian Horrors and the Question of the East* (London, 1876). Dostoevskii praises Gladstone's concerns in *A Writer's Diary*. There is an extensive literature on this topic that is duly quoted in my book.

My article on the Eastern Question was translated into Russian by the Russian Academy of Sciences. It is acknowledged as a novel approach that illuminates the Eastern Question and the roles of Dostoevskii as well as Tolstoi in counterpoint to imperial policies.

As to the efforts of Benjamin von Kállay to introduce the *Landessprache-zemaljski jezik*, later renamed the *Bosnian* language, it behooves one to remember that Kállay himself rescinded from this project. There was a widespread rejection by teachers to teach an artificially invented language. A number of men of letters, notably Prince Lujo Vojnovic from Dubrovnik voiced their concern about the so-called *zemaljski jezik*. There is a wealth of archival resources in German, Serbian, and Croatian languages related to this topic that are also quoted in my book.

JELENA MILOJKOVIĆ-DJURIĆ
Serbian Academy of Arts and Sciences

Dr. Bracewell responds:

Professor Milojković-Djurić has taken exception to my review but does not seem to have read my comments very carefully—she sees things that are not there (I merely cited her own assessment of Benjamin von Kállay's policies in Bosnia) and misinterprets others (I suggested that the losses suffered by the Bulgarians were due to something more serious than Turkish "pilferage," an example of the careless editing evident in the volume). And I can only repeat that her treatment ultimately tends to gloss over complexities and contradictions in the history of Slav ideals—in the case of the Russian reaction to the Eastern

Slavic Review 68, no. 3 (Fall 2009)

Crisis by implying that moral claims proved the deciding factor “in the final analysis” for all parties, including Alexander II, who “also chose the high road upholding Russia’s honor and commitment to the South Slavs” (14).

WENDY BRACEWELL

School of Slavonic and East European Studies, University College London

To the Editor:

While I appreciate Heather Williams’s review of my book, *Genocide and Resistance in Hitler’s Bosnia* (vol. 67, no. 2), she has misrepresented me on several points. Williams claims there is a “contradiction” between my reference to a single “Chetnik movement,” and my describing of it as, in her words, “not a disciplined, centralized movement with a leadership capable of ordering the genocide of Bosnian Muslims” and with “considerable local variations in the treatment of Muslims.” Yet it was the reality of the Chetnik movement that was contradictory, not my interpretation; I describe the contradictions. The tension between the Chetniks’ overall genocidal policy vis-à-vis the Muslims and Croats, and local variations in its interpretation, is one I explain (145–48). Williams accuses me of a “rather unsubtle heaping together of all non-Partisan elements in occupied Yugoslavia.” Yet I discuss in some detail the conflicts between the various non-Partisan elements, including between the Chetniks and Ustashas in which evidence suggests the Partisans collaborated with the latter against the former (208–12). Williams claims that, in my portrayal of Chetnik collaboration and Great Serbian goals, there is “a slight suspicion that he is a little too close to his Partisan sources.” Yet my conclusions derive from studying *Chetnik* sources. For example, I cite Chetnik leader Draza Mihailovic’s own report: “In the Sanjak we have liquidated all Muslims in the villages” (331); also his opinion that the entire Muslim population of Yugoslavia should be expelled “to Turkey or anywhere else outside our borders” (143).

MARKO ATTILA HOARE

Kingston University, London

Dr. Williams chooses not to respond.