Republican immediately found himself in the middle of the kidnapping of Ellen Stone and managed to offend everyone concerned. His counterpart, Stefan Panaretov, was more successful and had a long tenure in Washington. Pundeff's description of Panaretov's efforts to stave off an American declaration of war on Bulgaria after the United States entered World War I is an original contribution to the history of America's involvement in Eastern Europe.

The final three essays examine the establishment of a Bulgarian historiographical tradition. In addition to presenting the principal figures of Bulgarian historical writing, they investigate the cultural influences, primarily from German and Russian universities, that shaped Bulgarian views. In this context, one wishes that Pundeff's essay on the University of Sofia and its role in making the Bulgarian intelligentsia had been included.

Bulgarian interest in the United States is probably greater than American interest in Bulgaria. It is thus good to note that this volume is being published simultaneously in Sofia so that it can add to mutual Bulgarian-American understanding.

John D. Bell
University of Maryland Baltimore County


The war in the former Yugoslavia has encouraged the revival of historical myths and the proliferation of instant experts to interpret those myths for us. It is tragic enough that the myths and their distorted views of history bear some responsibility for the horrible devastation of Bosnia and its people; it is unconscionable that policy makers, political pundits, and some journalists in Western Europe and the United States have accepted the myths and used them to defend either their inaction or their misguided proposals for peace. Fortunately, there are serious scholars of the region whose research and writings stand as a challenge to the fiction that has all too often passed as fact. Robert Donia and John Fine belong to this group, and their collaborative effort in Bosnia and Hercegovina: A Tradition Betrayed is critical reading for any understanding of the Balkan conflict.

This is history with a passion and a purpose. Donia and Fine have studied Bosnia for decades, and they have grown to love the land and its people. Incensed by the war, they clearly worked tirelessly to produce this history and get it published as quickly as possible. From the first pages it is obvious that they want to convince their readers that Bosnia has had its own unique history and borders for centuries and that the essential character of Bosnian society has been one of pluralism and harmony among its several nationalities and religions. Thus, they view the war as a terrible betrayal of that tradition. This perspective permeates their analysis and explains their observation in the introduction that "this is not a conventional history."

The authors provide a broad sweep of history from the time of the Slavic migrations to the Balkan peninsula in the sixth and seventh centuries to the agony of the present war. This is a relatively short work, however, with minimal emphasis on chronology,
narrative, and significant events and people. Rather they have concentrated on the major developments, themes, and patterns over time which contributed to what they perceive as the distinctive Bosnian tradition of tolerance; and they have sought to understand the forces over the past century which have challenged that tradition and ultimately betrayed it.

Much of their analysis is designed to debunk the popular myths about the region. They argue that the medieval period established the broad outlines of Bosnia’s distinctiveness. Caught between the rival worlds of Catholic Europe and Orthodox Byzantium, Bosnia experienced the influences of both while struggling to maintain an independence which lasted well into the fifteenth century and was characterized most interestingly by the establishment of a unique Bosnian church. While Bosnia was involved in frequent wars during the medieval period, in none of them were Bosnians fighting one another because of religious or ethnic differences. In fact, the authors can find no examples of ethnic or religious conflict among Bosnians during the long centuries before World War II, and remind us that throughout the medieval and Ottoman periods most Bosnians did not even use ethnic names to identify themselves.

The Ottoman period clearly brought dramatic changes to Bosnia. Large numbers of the native Christian population converted to Islam, and Bosnia became one of the most important Ottoman provinces in Europe. While the Ottomans categorized people according to their religion, they also allowed a level of tolerance among religions that only encouraged a continuation of Bosnia’s tradition. Of course, Christians were in a subordinate position in Bosnia; and in the latter centuries of Ottoman rule as central power deteriorated, the lives of many Christians were adversely affected. This contributed to the myth that the Christian population suffered a terrible oppression during the entire Ottoman period. The authors argue that while this reading of history abated over the last century, the myth is “something that can be played upon and greatly distorted by publicists. Thus it is not history itself but the use made of it by leaders with ulterior motives that is at present poisoning relations among people who were accustomed to living in peace and tolerating their neighbors of other nationalities and faiths.”

The theme of distortion and manipulation of history by contemporary leaders is central to their argument about Bosnia. While they acknowledge the emergence of ethnoreligious communities in the nineteenth century and the subsequent development of ethnic consciousness and political nationalism among the Serbs, Croats, and Muslims in Bosnia, still they insist that relations among these peoples “were marked by mutual tolerance and frequent intermingling in everyday life.” Even the popular uprisings and revolts in Bosnia in the post-Ottoman period were interpreted by the authors as essentially social conflicts which were never ethnic or national in character until sometime in the early twentieth century.

Of course, the establishment of political parties based on national or religious identity transformed Bosnia in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries and challenged the relative harmony of the preceding centuries. If Bosnia could have placed an impenetrable fence around its borders to shield it from the onslaught of nationalist rhetoric and myth coming from Serbia and Croatia, perhaps the historical legacy of tolerance might have been preserved. That did not happen, however, and Bosnia had