

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:

Thomas Cushman is to be congratulated for his balanced, insightful review of Robert M. Hayden's *Blueprints for a House Divided* (*Slavic Review*, vol. 60, no. 1) and for showing the ways in which academic work may become harnessed to political agendas. Hayden's book has also come in for telling criticism in Europe, where Christian Boulanger has criticized Hayden for allowing empirical and normative theories to become entangled and for adopting the logic of nationalism as his own (posted at userpage.fu-berlin.de/~boulanger/texte/RezHayden.htm; see also the review of Hayden's book in *Suedost Europa*, November–December 2000). Hayden imagines that he has made some big discoveries in identifying the role of the federal structure, the pernicious impact of the concept of the "national state," and the importance of the role played by certain leaders, in driving forward and framing the breakup of Yugoslavia, but these ideas, usually associated with some attention to economic deterioration, are commonplace in the literature. These ideas have been previously argued, in whole or in part, in my *Balkan Babel* (1992), Viktor Meier, *Wie Jugoslawien verspielt wurde* (1996), Laura Silber and Allan Little, *The Death of Yugoslavia* (1995), Nebojsa Popov, ed., *Srpska strana rata* (1996), and Reneo Lukic and Allen Lynch, *Europe from the Balkans to the Urals* (1996). Hayden's bibliography, however, shows many gaps in his reading; had he paid more attention to the literature, he would have found these ideas already in circulation. At the same time, Hayden's stress on Slovene "guilt" is surely misplaced, while his lame endeavor to equate a characterization of Yugoslav state dynamics with idiocies about ancient hatreds makes one wonder if he has fully grasped that Yugoslavia was founded only in 1918.

SABRINA RAMET

Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU), Trondheim

To the Editor:

First of all, I would like to thank Michael Ellman for his review essay concerning my father's book, *Tak bylo: Razmyshleniia o minuvshem* (*Slavic Review*, vol. 60, no. 1). For the most part, I found the description of the book itself and Ellman's thoughts about the book and its contents objective and fair. Nevertheless, I feel it necessary to point out where my view differs from Ellman's.

Ellman writes: "In some cases one has the suspicion that what is written reflects the views of the editor at least as much as those of his late father. Did Mikoian really dictate or write the final paragraph of the book or did the editor add it to make the book more palatable to modern readers?" (141). This suspicion arises because the author is no longer alive. I feel obliged to state, however, that I did not "correct" my father's stories. This should be clear from the numerous instances of views presented in the book that were not terribly complimentary to my father's image, many of which are cited by Ellman (for example, Mikoian's continued support for the Non-Aggression Pact with Germany, even as he was dictating his memoirs). And Ellman writes, "Mikoian does honestly state, however, that in

Slavic Review 60, no. 4 (Winter 2001)