

## LETTERS

---

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:

Bohdan Harasymiw's review of my book, entitled *Cleft Countries: Regional Political Divisions and Cultures* in Post-Soviet Ukraine and Moldova, contains factual misrepresentations (*Slavic Review*, vol. 66, no. 3). He claims that this book tells specialists in the field nothing new about Moldovan and Ukrainian history. But he distorts history and misstates a central thesis of the book by saying that it attributes regional political cleavages and conflicts in both Moldova and Ukraine to historical legacies of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy and the Russian empire. In fact, Moldova did not belong to the Austro-Hungarian monarchy. My study talks about legacies of Romanian and Soviet rule in Moldova. His numerous charges of serious omissions are mostly unfounded. The book provides definitions of "culture" (42–43) and "nationalist" (69). It clearly states that regional divisions in other countries are examined to illustrate the role of historical legacies and to compare these divisions with Ukraine and Moldova (44, 58–59). Differences among various Ukrainian regions and changes in regional divisions in Ukraine over time, particularly during the 2006 elections, are examined in the book and in my other publications (69–89, 97–126, and 209–20). "Heavy reliance on secondary sources" is a misleading claim, because this book is based on original analyses of regional results of elections and referendums and two major surveys conducted in post-Soviet Ukraine and Moldova. Harasymiw's comment that my mother, to whom the book is dedicated, was "confused by politics" for "without ever leaving home she managed to live in four different countries under several different regimes," ignores a part of my acknowledgment, which says that she experienced first-hand ethnic cleansing (forcing her to flee Poland), the Nazi genocide, and the Soviet terror. While Harasymiw questions the political role of historical experience transmitted through socialization in the family, this is a central thesis of my book.

IVAN KATCHANOVSKI  
*University of Toronto, Canada*

Professor Harasymiw chooses not to respond.

To the Editor:

Andrea Petó's review of our collection, *Gender and War in Twentieth-Century Eastern Europe* (*Slavic Review*, vol. 66, no. 4) contains significant errors.<sup>o</sup>

Some are gaffes: The book's origin was a conference in Minsk, one that she helped organize; a glance at the contributors would have shown her that many were already well be-

*Slavic Review* 67, no. 2 (Summer 2008)