

From the Editor:

Slavic Review publishes letters to the editor 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 limited to one paragraph; comment on an article should not exceed 750 to 1,000 words. The editor encourages writers to refrain from ad hominem discourse.

D.P.K.

To the Editor:

I respond to Ivo Banac's review of my *Yugoslavia as History* (*Slavic Review* 57, no. 2), not because he fails to acknowledge the urgent need for a new such survey, nor because a second printing has corrected the proofreading errors he laments. I object because Banac misrepresents my three pre-1914 chapters and dodges the subsequent nine. He concentrates on contending that "Lampe is overwhelmed by his view that all pre-1918 developments point to the rise of the Yugoslav state(s). The agencies of dissolution seem insignificant by contrast." But my introduction (4–6) skewers the assumption of such convergence as a Yugoslav communist variant of Marxist determinism. Banac specifically fastens on my phrase "related but separate peoples" as an "ahistorical trope." The condescendingly precious choice of words aside, are we to conclude that "separate *and* unrelated" is the more accurate *historical* understanding of the largely South Slav peoples overlapping the pre-1918 landscape, that Yugoslavia's dissolution was preordained from the start? In any case, my initial chapters emphasize disjunctures and treat any sort of Yugoslavia as a late-emerging option, only created in fact as a consequence of World War I. The "anachronisms" he cites as discrediting these chapters for any "critical specialist" turn out to be the modern placenames and ethnic designations, with repeated emphasis on how *indistinct* or mixed the latter were through the early modern period, needed to orient readers who are not specialists, critical or otherwise. For the bulk of the book dealing with the two Yugoslavias, Banac opaquely cites an overreliance on "significant facts," presumably a sin of pre-postmodernism, and volunteers only a list of five "major analytical problems that Lampe never really addresses." The first four, dealing primarily with Croatia and exclusively with the period 1914–41, *are* addressed, although not treated at monographic length nor with the archival research that Banac rightly encourages. As for the impact on subsequent ethnic cohesion of World War II's "occupationist regimes" (thus equating Serbia and Croatia?) and the Partisan mobilization of resistance, my last two chapters emphasize fateful ethnic consequences for migration and employment, the media and religion, party and military structures, and on pages 326–36, how their interrelations became "agencies of dissolution" by 1989.

JOHN R. LAMPE
University of Maryland, College Park

Professor Banac replies:

The day after John Lampe stops stereotyping me he will perhaps realize that the phrase "related but separate peoples" is ahistorical not because I see his peoples as "separate and unrelated" but because his terminology is misleading for the period before the national integrations. Another "dodge"? No. Simply a recognition of the uselessness of it all.

IVO BANAC
Yale University

Slavic Review 58, no. 1 (Spring 1999)