

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:

I thank Robert J. Donia for reviewing my book, *First Do No Harm: Humanitarian Intervention and the Destruction of Yugoslavia* (vol. 69, no. 3). However, the review contains significant factual errors.

Donia criticizes my book for omitting various facts, such as the French president's support for western intervention in Bosnia in 1995, and U.S. ambassador Warren Zimmermann's denial that he scuttled peace talks in 1992. In reality, the book cites both points (284–85, 264), and Donia is mistaken. And he refers to "Prime Minister" Tony Blair with respect to the 1995 intervention; Blair did not become prime minister until 1997.

Donia's main criticism is that my book is marred by left-wing bias, and its facts are slanted to suit this bias. To sustain his point, Donia uses emotionally charged adjectives (e.g., variants of the words "leftist" or "ideological" are repeated many times throughout the review). Yet Donia fails to quote any ideological-sounding lines from the book or to substantiate his claims in any serious way.

And finally, the review is self-contradictory. In the same paragraph, Donia admits that "the author cites an impressive array of western opinion and commentary" but then reverses himself and states, "the author follows a pattern of using shallow and dubious evidence" (754). He repeatedly claims that my arguments are weak and my tone shrill. Then in the concluding paragraph, he reverses himself: "The arguments and evidence in this book are well constructed, and the account is eminently readable" (755).

DAVID N. GIBBS  
*University of Arizona*

Professor Donia chooses not to respond.

To the Editor:

In the acknowledgements to his "Stories of the Undead in the Land of the Unburied: Magical Historicism in Contemporary Russian Fiction" (vol. 68, no. 3), Alexander Etkind thanks me, among others, for my "comments and questions" (631). Had I actually seen his article prior to its publication, my comments would have been that this expression of "appreciation" should be replaced by a full set of references to my book *Goticheskoe obshchestvo* published in 2007 (Dina Khapaeva, *Goticheskoe obshchestvo. Morfologiya koshmara* [Moscow: NLO, 2007; 2d ed., 2008]).

In *Goticheskoe obshchestvo* I suggested that post-Soviet fictional monsters reflect, in a

*Slavic Review* 70, no. 1 (Spring 2011)