

Bosnia Remade: Ethnic Cleansing and Its Reversal. By Gerard Toal and Carl T. Dahlman. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011. xxiii, 463 pp. Appendix. Notes. Bibliography. Index. Figures. Tables. Maps. \$39.95, hard bound.

The wars of the 1990s in the former Yugoslavia brought the phrase “ethnic cleansing,” a literal translation of *etničko čišćenje* in Serbo-Croatian, into the international lexicon as a new term for a common twentieth-century practice of forced removals of minorities from a nationalizing state. What was unusual was the international effort to reverse such acts of brutality, which have more often been tolerated or even engineered by the great powers. In this new work, Gerard Toal and Carl T. Dahlman approach both processes, removal and return, in the formerly Yugoslav republic that saw the most widespread forced movement, with almost half of the prewar population being either refugees or “internally displaced.” The 1995 Dayton accords that ended the war provided the displaced with a right to return to their prewar homes, and there were times in the decade following the end of the war during which the international overseers of Bosnia tried to effectuate these guarantees.

And there were more times when they did not. Toal and Dahlman note the contradiction between the Dayton Agreement’s provisions for the right of return of the displaced with that same agreement’s institutionalization of Bosnia’s division into ethnationally defined polities. They see ethnic cleansing as a form of geopolitics aimed at producing a new ethnoterritorial ordering of space and ethnocentric political orders in that space. Dayton institutionalized both, making it difficult for people to return to places where members of other groups were in control.

Toal and Dahlman do an exceptional job of analyzing the successes and the more frequent failures of minority returns in Bosnia. This is a data-heavy study, providing more statistical information concerning minority returns than can easily be found elsewhere. The authors are innovative, moreover, in their case studies of three strategically critical towns that were hotly contested and saw waves of ethnic cleansing: Zvornik and Doboï in the Republika Srpska, and Jajce in the Federation. Though they acknowledge not being experts in the region, they conducted extensive interviews in 2002, in English with internationals and via translators with others. Some of the data are extraordinary. Table 7.1 shows that the international community spent almost \$120 million on a UNHCR “Open Cities Initiative” that produced only 17,000 minority returns.

The study concludes that, although there have been some successes in getting minorities to return to their former homes, ethnic cleansing has largely succeeded. The reasons for this include the institutionalization of ethnocracies that are resistant to the return of expelled minorities as well as the unwillingness of many people to leave the cities they had become accustomed to living in to return to a difficult rural life and the general economic and social collapse in Bosnia that induced many who left the country to avoid returning and persuaded many others to leave.

In its extensive data presentations, maps, and tables, *Bosnia Remade* resembles Steven L. Burg’s and Paul S. Shoup’s *The War in Bosnia-Herzegovina* (1999), which sets a high standard for detailed analysis of the Bosnian conflict by area experts who drew extensively on original material in Serbo-Croatian. Those authors, however, could assess what Bosnians and other ex-Yugoslavs were saying to each other in their own language(s), as opposed to what they were saying in English to foreigners, which Toal and Dahlman, who acknowledge not knowing the language, cannot do. Unfortunately, this leads the latter to encapsulate their original and valuable analysis of ethnic cleansing and efforts at its reversal within a politically correct, and thus not always very insightful, analysis of Bosnian society and politics. The argument that the Dayton Agreement’s institutions “thwart the common life, shared political attitudes and future aspirations of the Bosnian people” (314) is a platitude; it has been clear since Yugoslavia went into crisis that, although there is a Bosnian population, there is no single Bosnian people, in the sense of nation (*narod*), but rather three primary ones, and neither is there evidence of such a single nation in Bosnia since at least the late Ottoman period. It remains true that about half of the Bosnian population rejects the rule of a Bosnian state, which is why the Dayton institutions are what they are. But this is not new, because since the late Ottoman period Bosnia’s three main peoples have coexisted peacefully only when the land was ruled by outside powers.

Thus while the data on ethnic cleansing in this book are excellent, the political arguments betray the authors' acknowledged lack of area expertise and lack of access to original materials in the local language.

ROBERT M. HAYDEN
University of Pittsburgh

Medicine, Law and the State in Imperial Russia. By Elisa M. Becker. Budapest: Central European University Press, 2011. x, 399 pp. Notes. Index. Illustrations. Photographs. \$45.00, hard bound.

Elisa Becker has produced the definitive study of forensic medicine in imperial Russia, examining in detail the ways medical and legal professionals interacted to develop a unique set of practices and professional aspirations. This well-written book draws on Becker's extensive reading and some archival material. When she offers broader generalizations about Russian professions based on one example from the nineteenth century, however, the book is less convincing.

Becker's five chapters focus on 1) the background from Peter to 1861; 2) scientific expertise at the beginning of the Reform Era; 3) the process of drafting and adopting the forensic-medical reform statute and its implications for a professional identity as part of the state apparatus; 4) the consequences of a criminal procedure system in which investigation was inquisitorial while court proceedings were adversarial; and 5) implementation of the statute and the debates over revising it and enhancing the professional status of forensic medical specialists. Physicians whose opinions had been accepted without question under the prereform inquisitorial system were not pleased to be confronted by lawyers trained in forensic medicine who questioned their conclusions. Invoking "frenzy" to exculpate guilt brought physicians into direct conflict with government administrators and legal professionals, though Becker also shows the ways medical and legal experts made common cause by the 1890s.

Most of the archival sources deal with the adoption of the legal reforms concerning forensic medicine, focusing on the era of Alexander II. The period after 1881, and especially the years of the significant development of Russia's professional organizations after 1891, get short shrift. Becker's story emphasizes one group of medical specialists during the early years of reform. Yet she repeatedly talks about "physicians" as if they were involved in forensic medicine as their primary concern.

Members of every profession saw their calling as unique and crucial to Russia's development. Even when they managed to make common cause and extract (temporary) concessions from the tsarist regime in 1905, each profession continued to emphasize its special role. But 1905 and the Union of Unions are outside Becker's scope. Becker dismisses most existing scholarship on Russian professions as endeavoring to force them into a Procrustean bed of western models. She never explores whether historians have focused on the "liberal" model of professions because they believe in it or because many Russian professionals themselves articulated it.

There was a persistent tension between a profession's power versus an individual professional's power in an autocratic system. It was enormously tempting for lawyers, doctors, and others to seek the ruler's approval of their actions in the belief that they would thereby be in a position to further the interests of "the profession." The danger, of course, is that noninstitutionalized influence could be curtailed as easily as it could be conferred.

Becker's account stops in the 1890s, even though much of the older literature she critiques focuses on 1905. Her assertion that, "At the turn of the century, medical and legal reformers jointly sought to enhance their own occupational influence, independence and authority" (266), does not strike this reviewer as significantly different from earlier studies of Russian professionals.

How typical is forensic medicine of the Russian medical profession? I vividly remember a good friend who directed the pathology lab at a Leningrad hospital in the early 1980s regaling us with an account of the institution's party secretary coming to lecture him about